21756

National Library of Canada

Bibliothèque nationale du Canada

CANADIAN THESES ON MICROFICHE

*THÈSES CANADIENNES SUR MICROFICHE*

NAME OF AUTHOR/*NOM DE L'AUTEUR* Patricia S. Barry

TITLE OF THESIS/*TITRE DE LA THÈSE* The King in Tudor Drama

UNIVERSITY/*UNIVERSITÉ* University of Alberta

DEGREE FOR WHICH THESIS WAS PRESENTED/ *GRADE POUR LEQUEL CETTE THÈSE FUT PRÉSENTÉE* ~~Ph~~ Doctor of Philosophy

YEAR THIS DEGREE CONFERRED/*ANNÉE D'OBTENTION DE CE DEGRÉ* 1974

NAME OF SUPERVISOR/*NOM DU DIRECTEUR DE THÈSE* John O. Orrell

Permission is hereby granted to the NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

*L'autorisation est, par la présente, accordée à la BIBLIOTHÈQUE NATIONALE DU CANADA de microfilmer cette thèse et de prêter ou de vendre des exemplaires du film.*

*L'auteur se réserve les autres droits de publication; ni la thèse ni de longs extraits de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans l'autorisation écrite de l'auteur.*

DATED/*DATÉ* Sept. 18, 1974 SIGNED/*SIGNÉ* Patricia S. Barry

PERMANENT ADDRESS/*RÉSIDENCE FIXÉ*
14322 Ravine Dr.
Edmonton, Alberta
CANADA

NL-91 (11-73)

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

# The King in Tudor Drama

by

©

Patricia Steepee Barry

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE

OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

FALL, 1974

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research, for acceptance, a thesis entitled "The King in Tudor Drama" submitted by Patricia Steepee Barry in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

J. Orrell
Supervisor

Wilfred Watson

External Examiner

Date 16th August, 1924

# ABSTRACT

So many kings and kinglike characters appear in the plays of the Tudor period that stage royalty appears to be of special importance for English dramatists from 1485 to 1603. Some critics have demonstrated that one of Shakespeare's guiding principles in dramatizing kings is his perception of the king as an actor which leads him to express the drama of royalty in the metaphor of the play. The present study, while it does not ignore Shakespeare's achievements in portraying princely characters, focuses attention on the other stage kings of the whole Tudor period and on the techniques of portraying royalty in order to demonstrate that other playwrights of the times share Shakespeare's interest in royalty's function as performance.

A short Introduction is followed by seven chapters defining and describing ways of characterizing royalty common to Tudor dramatists, with illustrations from selected dramatic works containing king figures. The argument begins in Chapter I with the simplest kind of stage figure identifiable as a king character, and examines some of the standard methods by which Tudor dramatists can define him as a sovereign ruler distinct from other kinds of characters. Chapter II examines the confusing Tudor convention of giving attributes of majesty to characters representing extraordinary power who often appear in the same plays as ordinary king figures.

The subject of Chapter III is the representation of ordinary

princely personae as moral beings in dramas organized around divine and demonic figures or according to the traditions of Christian Prince and Tyrant. Chapter IV examines the practice of defining the king figure as a social being through the traits shared with conventional figures of the Renaissance stage and literature.

The next three chapters comprise the discussion of royal characterization as it is complicated through theatrical imagery. Chapter V deals with scenic imagery first, the spectacle of royalty in the play. Chapter VI treats some of the uses of pictorial language useful for defining the royal "personality" and for enlarging the scope of royal affairs which could be included in the drama. Chapter VII shows that Tudor dramatists achieve some of their most complex statements about the nature of royalty through the interplay of spectacle and language.

Chapter VIII reviews motifs related to the Actor King already touched upon in the study of characterization techniques. To show conclusively that a portrait of the kingly character as a performer is also the object of other Tudor playwrights besides Shakespeare, royal characters from three works are examined as compositions of characterization techniques already described. The royal figures who are portrayed as performers are York civic cycle's Herod, John Skelton's Magnyfycence, and the conventional rulers in Christopher Marlowe's Tamburlaine. The chapter ends with a study of Titania in A Midsummer Night's Dream for the explanation she offers for the Tudor playwrights' interest in the Actor King.

Chapter IX proposes that the theme of the Actor King, which finds perfection in Shakespeare's royal drama, is an old dramatic tradition in England, and is a theme appropriate to the Renaissance as well as to Tudor drama of every generation.

# ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I owe much to my friends and family who have encouraged me during my studies. I am especially obligated to my mother, herself a maker of many plays. My husband, Dr. Thomas W. Barry, and my son, Samuel, have been more generous and helpful than I deserve; I owe them both many intellectual debts.

I am also grateful to the University of Alberta librarians; to Mrs. Norah K. Gurney, archivist at the University of York's Borthwick Institute of Historical Research; and to city librarians in York and Norwich. My thanks are due Mrs. Rhoda Warke, Public Stenographer, who took special care in typing.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

INTRODUCTION . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 1

CHAPTER I . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 13

CHAPTER II . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 42

CHAPTER III . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 64

CHAPTER IV . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 95

CHAPTER V . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 130

CHAPTER VI . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 157

CHAPTER VII . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 184

CHAPTER VIII . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 218

CHAPTER IX . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 257

FOOTNOTES . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 260

CLASSIFIED BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . . . . . . . . . . 283

# Introduction

The numerous plays containing kings and kinglike characters that appear in Sixteenth and Seventeenth Century English dramatic literature have attracted critical attention since early in this century when Professor Felix Schelling, attempting to trace the evolution of the history play in England, found that about 150 dramas of the period 1586 to 1606 could be categorized as chronicle plays.[1] The fact that most plays in his list contain figures of royalty, that is, kings, queens, princes, and other characters representing sovereign rulers over other mortals, points to the importance of princely personae to Elizabethan dramatists.

After Professor Schelling, scholars and critics concentrated their efforts on Shakespeare's history plays and on the treatment of the king figures which dominate Shakespearean drama. Their work has helped our understanding of the English playwrights' craftsmanship in using historical matter, conventional ideas, and language to represent royalty on stage.[2] A few critics have perceived that a primary interest of Elizabethan playwrights in king plays, as we may conveniently call those dramas in which royal characters appear, is the portrait of royalty that could be presented in them. Two critics in particular have found that the dramatic role a king must play in filling his office, the king's function as a performer in other words, or his "character" as an actor, furnishes a set of themes deeply appealing to the imagination of Shakespeare, the supreme creator of royalty in the theatre.

In 3 Henry VI, according to James Winny, Shakespeare has already broached the idea that a man's private identity differs from his public countenance, and he has joined the issue with the concept of the Player King. In Act III, Scene i, when the deposed and captive Henry is unable to tell the forest keepers who he is,

> . . . Shakespeare is giving notice [says Professor Winny] of an imaginative interest which will be pressed more firmly in the plays to come. In each of the later histories the king is forced to come to terms with the nature of the royal identity which he has tried to assume, and to recognize a disparity between his ideal of majesty and his personal ability to fill the role assigned to him. The costume is laid out and the part rehearsed, but the performance falls short in respects which both actor and audience acknowledge. The player is not the king. . . . The unachieved magnificence of the king finally appears to lie beyond human reach; a part which the actor relinquishes in the disillusioned spirit expressed by the poet of the Sonnets. [3]

The attempts of three later Shakespearean kings, Richard II, Henry Bolingbroke, and Henry V, to enact the king's role gave Professor Winny the substance and the title of his book. His The Player King treats the split between the private man and the public man as the characteristic of royalty which provides a unifying theme of Shakespeare's later history plays.

Anne Righter goes much further than Professor Winny in ascribing to Shakespeare a preoccupation with the theme of the Player King. As groundwork for her argument, she follows, from about the mid-Sixteenth Century onward, the English playwright's increasing fascination with the metaphor of the play. Then, classical theories favouring the illusionary self-contained play, often with a chorus of citizens onstage, began to replace the medieval tradition of the audience as "actor," a convention which allowed a character in a drama to address the spectators as if they were the race of humanity to be saved by the stage Christ, or were the subjects ruled by the stage king.

Mrs. Righter finds that the play metaphor, as used in the Sixteenth Century, "insists upon the evanescent, insubstantial quality of the drama,"[4] and that it sometimes occurs as an undeclared play within a play. The play metaphor and its variations, she says, permeate the early work of Shakespeare as well as the writings of his contemporaries. Mrs. Righter observes:

> As might be expected, Shakespeare's early comedies explore play metaphors of a type different from those associated with Titus Andronicus or the histories of Henry VI. Yet there is one image common to all of these early plays. Deceit, whether comic or tragic, is a staple of drama and also a traditional meeting point of the actor and the ordinary man. In that soliloquy of his in Henry VI, Part Three, Richard spoke of Proteus as a model for dissemblers. It was a familiar name for the actor, one which the Puritans occasionally employed, and which Shakespeare himself chose for the actor-villain of The Two Gentlemen of Verona. . . . his villainy, like Richard's, is associated quite deliberately with the stage.[5]

Although Mrs. Righter does not belabour the connection, the association of the common player with deceit, dissembling, and protean transformation seems to mark Shakespeare's point of departure in translating the play metaphor into a portrayal of the king as an actor.

Mrs. Righter, like Professor Winny, has provided some helpful insights into Shakespeare's purposes in portraying king figures on the stage. But she has not included other English playwrights' interest in the king as a performer, or in that idea as a variation of the play metaphor. She says:

> Shakespeare's concern with the Player King is interesting not only because of its persistence, the fact that this idea can be traced from Henry VI, Part Three to The Tempest, but because it seems to represent a use of the play metaphor that is almost unique with him. The entire range of English Renaissance drama, from the mid-sixteenth century to the closing of the theatres in 1642, yields surprisingly little

in the way of similar imagery, despite a multitude of plays offering abundant opportunity for its introduction.[6]

Kings and kinglike characters are present in at least one hundred of the extant plays that may be regarded as current from 1485 to 1603, a fact which shows that king plays were important to the whole Tudor period. My purpose is to draw attention to some of these other princely figures, because I want to demonstrate that, contrary to the impression Mrs. Righter gives, other Tudor playwrights could compose portraits of royalty reflecting themes similar to Shakespeare's, themes bearing on the dramatic artist's perception of royalty's function as performance. Finally, I want to suggest a reason for this interest.

My focus will not be on the plays' imagery or metaphoric texture alone, although these are vitalizing elements of drama. Instead, I shall examine the several techniques for depicting kings, image-making included, which Tudor playwrights shared. The study of the characterization of princely personae is to be the means of understanding such concepts of royalty as Tudor dramatists may have had in common, including the nature of royalty's performance.

This synoptic procedure is justified by two considerations. First, the subtlest and truest statements which may be made about a subject as complex as the idea of kingship in Renaissance England are, of necessity, the least susceptible to encapsulation in a single metaphor or image, in a single kind of imagery. In the late Fifteenth Century and during the Sixteenth Century, personages as diverse as Henry of Richmond and Pope Innocent VIII, Martin Luther and Sir Thomas More, Erasmus and Henry VIII, John Calvin and Elizabeth I had something to say or to effect about the nature of royalty. Their statements coincided at points, but never precisely duplicated each other. What is more, the concept of royalty was entangled with notions of sublime power, whether expressed as the divine appointing of kings, as the majesty of Christ, or as the kingship of the inner man. These notions, in turn, were infused with the idea of artistry as a divinely inspired shaping of matter at hand, including human matter and its facsimile, a cast of stage characters. This was a philosophical view that appealed to commoners no less than princes, to dramatic poets as well as kings. Such a view could find expression in either spectacle or words.

The second consideration dictating the form of this study is that the Tudor drama, as a multidimensional art, has more than one means of making statements about princeliness. Further, there are many practices and conventions appropriate to each means. The drama's several means work together, as we are about to discover, to produce statements about royalty that are at all significant in the Tudor period.

The study of characterization, then, must be such that we [illegible]sider the Tudor stage king for some of those many facets which dramatic art is capable of presenting. It must be a study which, in the end, reveals the dramatization of royalty as a statement made of many statements, a composition of ideas expressed in the techniques appropriate to the drama's several dimensions.

Some phases of the drama -- music, for one -- are beyond our competence, or are lost to us because of the ephemeral nature of the art. But spectacle and language, which are of concern here for their contribution to royal portraiture, happen to be those for which the most evidence exists. They are also especially appropriate for dramatizing king figures. Because king plays dramatize the magnificence of rule, they make frequent use of spectacle in repeatable conventional ways. And because language is a medium through which sovereignty is asserted, playwrights drew upon rich metaphoric traditions to compose princely speeches. Therefore, a useful approach to king plays will stress particularly those principle features of a royal drama which distinguish the king figure from other kinds of characters, the spectacle surrounding royal personae, and the verbal peculiarities of the dialogue involving princes.

The composite characterizations of king figures described here, although they are conceived in accordance with each dramatic artist's singular imagination and his personal technique, contain much the same perception of royalty as Shakespeare dramatized in his splendid player kings. The discussion leading toward the integrated portrait of royalty which Tudor dramatists could create begins in a small way, and proceeds, by means of over-simplification where necessary, through characterization techniques of increasing complexity.

It is neither desirable nor necessary to analyze all the king plays of the Tudor period in order to demonstrate the techniques and ideas early Tudor dramatists shared with Shakespeare and his contemporaries. Instead, the first seven chapters of this thesis, which are devoted to distinguishing and describing common ways of characterizing royalty in Tudor English drama, are illustrated with examples from dramatic works selected from those composed, compiled, revised, or produced during the Tudor period, from Henry VII's accession to

Elizabeth I's death.

Certain plays, Mary Magdalene, for example, and Godly Queen Hester, and Thomas Hughes' Misfortunes of Arthur, furnish occasional illustrations of the treatment of royalty. Others, such as The Chester Plays, George Peele's King Edward the First, John Bale's King Johan, and Thomas Preston's Cambyses King of Persia offer much rich material on the handling of king figures. The kingly characters of still other plays, among them Ludus Coventriae, Norton and Sackville's Gorboduc, the anonymous True Tragedy of Richard the Third, and the Royal Chapel play, The Wars of Cyrus, receive fairly full treatment in the course of the argument. A few works which Shakespeare composed by 1603, including his history plays, provide illustrations here and there, partly for the unabashed purpose of whetting the reader's appetite. Among the fine playwrights whose king figures are not cited, or are mentioned only in passing, are the Towneley cycle dramatists, and John Heywood, John Lyly, Thomas Kyd, and Thomas Dekker, while more than one king play each represent Peele, Robert Greene, and Christopher Marlowe.

As in choosing the techniques to be studied, so in choosing illustrations of them, the chief object is to represent the range and circumstances of Tudor King plays. Another object is to bring the reader to an appreciation of the personal ingenuity at work in those dramas. We resort to the same plays again and again in order to build up familiarity with a dramatist's complicated procedures. Needless to say, the passage or episode cited usually has a much deeper significance in its context than we attribute to it as an example of a device, technique or convention. For instance, in Chapter I, a reference to Shakespeare's Henry V, where the Archbishop of Canterbury speaks of the king's succession rights and of his forebears, illustrates a simple point about the king's genealogy. The simplicity of the point does not deny the greater importance of the speech in a continuing controversy among learned Englishmen about theories of kingship.[7] Here, the passage illustrates a convention which Shakespeare and other Tudor dramatists shared in portraying royalty on the stage, even though the individual artists gave it unique treatments.

Throughout the discussion, it is necessary to distinguish between the confusing meanings of two useful words. First, character, meaning a stage persona, mask, or role, in the traditional sense used by dramatists since classical times, differs from "character," meaning a kind of person or "personality," in the modern sense. The word characterization belongs to the second sense, "character," because it refers to the dramatist's way of making a persona seem like a certain kind of person. A second pair of homonyms whose referents overlap is type, meaning either likeness or copy, as we shall encounter it in Chapter II and III, or a conventional "character" and kind of stage persona, as we use the word in Chapter IV. The meaning intended for type, however, should be clear from its context wherever it appears, although the merging of its meanings, like that of character, is probably not without significance for Sixteenth Century dramatists.

Chapter by chapter, the thesis groups the important dramatic techniques and conventions of the times, not in mutually exclusive divisions, but as they can best reveal the craftsmanship that delineated royal characters. To avoid misunderstandings, the argument begins in Chapter I with the simplest kind of stage figure identifiable as a king "character." The chapter examines some of the standard methods Tudor dramatists used to identify a character as princely, and to distinguish him from other personae: the arrangements for his appearance, his attributes and actions, his own assertions, and the recognition by other characters that he is a king.

Chapter II introduces the "quasi-kings," characters of extraordinary sovereign power to whom the dramatists sometimes also gave attributes of majesty. The "quasi-kings" are the magnificos, the personifications of abstract ideas, and the supernatural figures, whom ordinary king figures might imitate, and with whom they might fuse. Characters of extraordinary powers who appear as royalty in Tudor king plays express a widespread feeling in Renaissance England that powerful personages, the supernatural world, and even ideas ruled mankind, and that they could govern kingly actions and so contribute to the "character" of ordinary royalty.

The order of discussion gradually moves toward more complicated ways in which Tudor playwrights constructed their portraits of royalty. The subject of Chapter III is the dramatization of ordinary princely personae as moral beings. Their moral "character," whether good, wicked, changeable, or ambiguous, is established through the moral structure of the drama, sometimes organized under the influence of the supernatural and abstract royalty introduced in Chapter III, and sometimes organized according to a dichotomy of ordinary kings as the Christian Prince and the Tyrant.

Chapter IV explores the techniques of defining the particulars of the king figure as a social being, so that he seems to possess, in addition to his moral "character," traits which make him a member of the conventional social world. Examples show how king figures, as handled by different dramatists, acquired the rudiments of their "personalities" by sharing characteristics with conventional stage types drawn from a host of new social attitudes and "characters" interesting to Renaissance Englishmen.

The next three chapters comprise the discussion of theatrical imagery, or the imitation of the appearances of things, through which the playwrights dramatized the more subtle features of their princely personae. Chapter V deals with scenic imagery first, the spectacle of royalty in the play, from the symbolic props and emblematic scenery to tableaux and configurations of action which contribute to the representation of royalty. Sometimes, as in the case of court entertainments, the dramatist incorporated into his dramaturgical design the spectacle of the living monarch who was attending the play as a spectator, a device which included royalty in the cast.

Language as it complicates the portrait of royalty is the subject of Chapter VI. The chapter first treats the heightened language of royal speeches to show how the poetry of metaphors complicates the "character" of the king. Another use of language, allusions to invisible things and reports of unstaged scenes, enlarges the scope of royal actions and princely thoughts which may be included in the play.

Chapter VII shows that Tudor dramatists achieved some of their most refined and complex statements about royalty by intermingling their conventions of using spectacle and language. The discussion begins with some simple examples from the king plays of coordinated scene and words. It ends by describing composite treatments of royalty so complex as to affect nearly every detail of a drama constructed about the figure of a king.

The topic of the Actor King as a recurring theme of Shakespeare's royal portraiture, an interpretation already accepted by critics, opens Chapter VIII, which reviews related motifs touched upon earlier in the study of characterization techniques. To show conclusively that making a portrait of the kingly character as a performer was also the object of other Tudor playwrights besides Shakespeare, we shall examine, as composite examples of characterization techniques already described, the portraits of royal characters from four fresh works selected from the Tudor dramatic repertoire. The royal figures who are portrayed as performers in one sense or another are York civic cycle's Herod, John Skelton's Magnyfycence, the conventional rulers in Christopher Marlowe's Tamburlaine, and -- because it is fitting to end with Shakespeare -- Titania, the Fairy Queen in A Midsummer Night's Dream.

The argument concludes in Chapter IX by proposing that the theme of the Actor King was an old dramatic tradition in England, one that underlay the characterization of many royal figures created by Tudor playwrights. That theme found its most perfect expression in Shakespeare's chronicle plays, and in his later dramas which elaborate the idea further, as Mrs. Righter has correctly perceived. But the depiction of the king as a performer occurred often enough in the drama of Shakespeare and his predecessors to be considered a portrait of royalty important for Tudor drama as a whole. Moreover, in emphasizing the similarities between royal personages and the professional "counterfeiters" who portrayed them onthe stage and in the playing place, the theme of the Actor King also conforms to the spirit of the Renaissance. Whether the king was an actor, or, reversing the notion, as Erasmus did, an actor was king, the theme expressed the aspiration of men of all estates and conditions to an ideal human nature, one with godlike and majestic power over others, even though that power was contrived through artifices of speech and dramatic show.

# Chapter I

The first order of business for the Tudor dramatist who undertook to produce a king play was to present a recognizably regal figure on the stage or in the playing place. The spectators had to know a kingly character when they saw one, and know him also when he spoke. Only then could they begin to understand what kind of king they were watching in the show. Stage kings and queens are different from the characters surrounding them, whether archbishops, knights, or shepherds. The dramatist made that difference plain, so that the audience knew that one character represented a sovereign ruler, while another did not.

This chapter shows what Tudor dramatic poets ordinarily did to make certain figures in their plays recognizable as royalty, as personae distinct from other kinds of characters. The royal spectacle as produced in a play amounted to a simulation of the magnificence which constituted the genuine royal panoply, and the decorum surrounding the stage king was a reasonable token of that in a sovereign court. Although the playwrights borrowed their techniques of distinguishing royalty from the pomp, ceremony, and decorum surrounding royalty in real life, of necessity they did not reproduce everything pertaining to a king. Therefore, rather than following theoretical schemes defining the splendour and circumstance appropriate for royalty, we shall look in the plays themselves to find the pattern of customary procedures for identifying royal personae.

The whole Tudor repertoire furnishes abundant illustrations of the fundamentals of dramatizing the sovereign style, dignity, and power in spectacle, costume, decorum, and speech. Here, for the moment, the dates of king plays and the conditions of their production are of little concern, except to guide a choice of illustrations which will represent the range of Tudor royal drama. A glance at some two dozen king plays, established as of Tudor provenance, and selected to represent the variety of drama which Tudor audiences enjoyed, will provide enough examples to determine the principal techniques the Tudor dramatists used to identify a stage king as the personage he was supposed to be.

The discussion, then, will follow procedures usual in the plays, first treating the spectacle which makes the "presence" of royalty known, and then illustrating some typical treatments of the distinctive royal manner through the king figure's statements and commands. Next, we shall glance briefly at a category of dramatic practices which identified personae as kingly through the deportment of other characters who address them in the play. Finally, we shall describe two general kinds of dramatic situation in which Tudor dramatists typically involved their king figures, situations in which assertions of sovereign status or identity are inherent. Throughout this discussion, the examples chosen illustrate the versatility with which Tudor dramatists could handle conventional devices in composing their complex portraits of royalty.

To begin at the beginning, with the spectacle of a king figure's approach, we find dramatists notifying their audiences that a king is coming. That is the function of the herald who precedes Herod into the playing place in the Coventry Shearmen and Taylors' pageant. Herod's Nonseose commands silence and respect to let everyone know that a king has arrived. Distorting the language of the ancient court, as the English commoner was wont to do, he bawls out in French:

> Payis, seneoris, schevaleris de nooble posance!
> Pays, gentis homos. . . .
> Je vose cummand. . . sylance.
> . . . . . . . . . . .
> Payis, tanque vottur nooble Roie syre ese presance!
> E lay Roie erott la grand. . . .
> (476-485)[1]

The anonymous author of the interlude, *King Darius,* chose another way to accomplish the same purpose. His prolocutor informs the audience that "A certayne king to you, we shall bring in" (sig. A$2^{r}$).[2] Further on, two servants of Darius get ready for the king's entry by trying to make their own presence seem dramatically logical and socially correct:

> *Preparatus*
>
> Surely my eyes sore misgoes,
> If yonder I doe not see him comming.
>
> *Agreeable*
>
> It should be he by the noyse making,
> . . . . . . . . . . .
> Loe yonder come such a company.
> Yonder he is with the Lordes of his Chyvalry.
>
> *Preparatus*
>
> Let us fayne some fable of olde,
> And to tell it the King be we bolde.
> What was the cause we were here him before.
> (sig. D$1^{v}$)

George Peele used the same device in his King Edward the First, where the announcement of a royal entry is incorporated into the dramatic situation.

> Jone. Madam it is the King.
>
> [Queen] Elinor. Welcome my Lord hey ho what have we there? (1754-1756)[3]

Thomas Norton employed the whole first scene of Gorboduc's first act to prepare the audience for the appearance of the king. The queen and a prince talk of nothing but the king's willful succession policy, the cause of Videna's distress. Their dialogue heralds the king's appearance. Gorboduc finally reveals himself in the next scene.[4]

The author of Locrine arranged an equally lugubrious preparation for the entrance of King Brutus. Here are the stage directions for a dumbshow opening the first act in which a goddess of mischief alludes to the coming king by means of a royal beast:

> Enter Atey with thunder and lightning all in black,
> with a burning torch in one hand, and a bloodie
> sword in the other hand, and presently let there
> come foorth a Lion running after a Beare or any
> other beast, then come foorth an Archer who must
> kill the Lion. . . and then depart.
> (I, i, 2-8)[5]

Atey remains behind to explain the dumbshow as an allegory of the king's life:

> So valiant Brute the terror of the world,
> Whose only lookes did scarre his enemies,
> The Archer death brought to his latest end.
> (I, i, 26-28)

Thus announced, the aged king is carried on stage in a chair to make his dying speeches.

Something less alarming is the way Christopher Marlowe prepares and announces the royal entry in Edward the Second. The play begins with Gavestone reading a letter from the king:

> My father is deceast, come Gaveston
> And share the kingdom with thy deerest friend.
> (3-4)[6]

As Gavestone perambulates the stage, he soliloquizes:

> Sweete prince I come. . . .
> . . . . . . . . . . . .
> The sight of London to my exiled eyes,
> Is as Elizium to a new come soule. . . .
> (8-13)

By the time he has dealt with a trio of poor men and has contemplated plans for life at court, Gavestone has "arrived" at court. He starts from his reverie:

> . . . heere comes the king and the nobles
> From the parlement, ile stand aside.
> (75-76)

And with a timing calculated for dramatic convenience, the king and his train enter.

In Thomas Preston's Cambyses King of Persia, Ambidexter, the vice, acting on the spur of the moment, assumes the herald's role, calling out with mock pomposity: "Beholde where the king doth come with his train" (sig. D2$^{v}$).[7] The king does indeed enter, but with only a single lord behind him.

The "train" or retinue was, of course, one of the identifying marks of important personages. It signified hierarchical rank, and power over other souls. It was visible evidence of estate, in all Sixteenth Century senses of the word. Attached to a kingly figure as he made his way into a playing place or onto a stage, the retinue became a component of the formal expression of sovereignty, the king's state.

It could later re-form into a scenic representation of a venerable English institution, the king's council. Tudor dramatists often specified that stage royalty be attended, even if the circumstances of the playing company -- or the playwright's design -- reduced the "meny" to a single follower.

The King Herods who bullied the country folk of Tudor England were usually accompanied by a retinue, if at times only token, in order to make more spectacular their entry before the crowd. Dukes follow Ludus Coventriae's Herod as he rides across the playing place on a horse to reach his royal palace, the scaffold (18:15).[8] Herod also seems to address his knights as he passes on his way (18:13); perhaps they are the same soldiers who later perform the Massacre of Innocents at his command. This Herod also has a steward or Senescallus, instead of a messenger or herald, who serves double duty in getting up a banquet later. Sixteenth Century accounts of the Smith's Company in Coventry show payments to four men to "bryng yn" their Herod, a character in episodes leading up to the Passion of Christ.[9] Two philosophers swell the ranks of Herod's minions in Mary Magdalene, a cyclical drama of the late Fifteenth Century (I, iv, 165).[10] They are versions of the "doctor" and the "dottipol," whom Herod eventually finds lacking in eloquence. Together with a contingent of knights, they form the king's state and council to whom he turns for advice.

The Magi, the three kings from the East, who sometimes took part in the Nativity episodes of cyclical dramas, could have separate retinues of their own. In the Coventry Shearmen and Taylors' pageant, Herod's messenger reports that the Magi, already in the playing place, are coming with a "grett cumpany" (606). A stage direction in Mary Magdalene calls for the King of Marcylle to go "with all his a-tendaunt to þe tempyll" (II, xxxv, 1538).

In King Edward the First, George Peele employs the king's retinue to arouse audience anticipation and to provide theatrical effects that bring a king figure into focus. The Queen Mother sends off a delegation of lords to meet Longshanks, freshly home from the wars in Palestine. Then, while we imagine the heroic sovereign's triumphant approach, she delivers a rousing set speech about brave England, "dreadfull in her kings" (31). The Queen evokes a picture of the "lovely Edward . . . your glory and our sonne,"

> With troopes of conquering Lords and warlike knights,
> Like bloudy crested Mars orelookes his hoste,
> Higher then all his armie by the head,
> Martching along as bright as Phoebus eyes,
> And we his mother shall beholde our sonne,
> And Englands Peeres shall see their Soveraigne.
> (40-45)

Trumpets sound, and

> enter the traine, viz. his maimed Souldiers with headpeeces and Garlands on them, every man with his red Crosse on his coate: the Ancient borne in a Chaire, his Garland and his plumes on his headpeece, his Ensigne in his hand. Enter after them Glocester and Mortimer bareheaded, & others as many as may be. Then Longshanks and his wife Elinor, Edmund Couchback, and Jone and Signior Moumfort the Earle of Leicesters prisoner, with Sailers and Souldiers, and Charles de Moumfort his brother.
> (46-55)

Peele was never at a loss when it came to getting royalty on stage in the grand manner. These are his stage directions for the multiple retinues assembled in King Edward the First when Longshanks was to crown a new king of Scotland:

> Enter the nine lordes of Scotland, with their nine pages, Glocester, Sussex, king Edward. . . , Queene Elinor, Queene Mother, the King and Queene under a Canopie.
> (683-686)

A fanfare blazes as Baliol receives the crown. The assembled company shouts "God save King Baliol," and formal speeches follow.

Francis Kinwelmersh also liked a grandiose presentation of his royal characters. He arranged a brilliant entrance for the queen in Jocasta, an English version of Euripides's tragedy, which he and George Gascoigne adapted for presentation at Gray's Inn in 1566:

> Jocasta the Queene issueth out of hir Pallace, before hir twelve Gentlemen, following after hir eight Gentlewomen, whereof foure be the Chorus that remayne on the Stage after hir departure. At hir entrance, the Trumpettes sounded, and after she had gone once about the Stage, she turneth to one of hir most trustie and esteemed servaunts. . . .
> (I, Dumbshow, 18-24)[11]

The positioning of the king in his state with his retinue about him indicated the relationships of the characters to the sovereign, and the degree of each personage in the social order. One of Peele's stage directions for King Edward the First shows that the formal arrangement was apt to be symmetrical as well as hierarchical:

> The Queene Mother being set on the one side, and Queene Elinor on the other, the king sitteth in the middest mounted highest, and at his feete the Ensigne underneath him.
> (117-119)

The composition is completed by the king's soldiers who circle the royal family protectively.

The stage retinue or train of a king figure readily transformed itself into the representation of a king-in-council. A Herod may consult the knights who form his procession. Longshanks's display of largesse for the benefit of his wounded soldiers who accompany him in King Edward the First is conducted in the manner of a council meeting, with the king among his vassals, sitting in final judgment on lesser donors. Later, in another king-in-council scene, Peele makes Longshanks preside as a judge over Scotland's "climbing peeres" (698). A knight and a councillor form the royal retinue in the opening scene of Preston's Cambyses King of Persia; once all are in place, the king invites these vassals to "Extend your councill" on the desirability of war with Egypt (sig. A2$^{v}$). Similarly, the lords who accompany Edward IV on stage in The True Tragedy of Richard the Third resolve the scene into a council of state met to settle troubles that imperil the realm.[12] When the prologue of Godly Queen Hester finishes speaking, King Assuerus is already in his chair, surrounded by a council of three gentlemen. His speech sets the tone for the formal procedures appropriate to such occasions, when councillors offer their advice one by one:

> Of these my lordes we woulde be glad to here,
> Which is most worthy honoure to attayne
> By your high reasons we thynke it maye appeare,
> To speake therefore we praye you, your sentences plaine
> And as ye determine, so shall we certaine,
> Advance to honoure, and to promotion applye
> Alwayes the best, and that bee most worthye.
> (15-21)[13]

A scaffold or loft could be occupied by any character in a drama who claimed dominion over others, but the throne upon the scaffold signified both the power and the majesty belonging to its royal occupant. Tudor audiences expected that the characters the dramatists placed on thrones were sovereign rulers. Herod's knights in Ludus

*Coventriae's* episode of the Massacre of Innocents address their king as "lorde in trone" (20:105). Herod himself boasts that "In sete now am I sett as kynge of myghtys most" (20:129). Emperor Tiberius Caesar in *Mary Magdalene* declares: "for þe most worthyest, woll I rest in my sete" (I, i, 19).

The throne, signifying the royal status in the social hierarchy, elevated the stage king above his surrounding vassals and subjects, while the whole company on the stage or scaffold was raised above the crowd below. As a seat of honour, the throne was a conventional and sometimes stationary fixture of Tudor stages. Even when empty, it could symbolize the royal dignity.[14] Some Tudor playwrights made the throne more than a scenic device or a convenient means of giving royalty a place visibly above the rest. In Shakespeare's *3 Henry VI*, the throne verges on being a stage property, falling into possession of one character of the play after another, beginning with the first act. Finally, in the last scene, King Edward enters with a flourish and seats himself on the throne. He and his retinue compose themselves into an ideal picture of the king in state, surrounded by family and vassals.

> *King*. Once more we sit in Englands Royall Throne,
> Re-purchac'd with the Blood of Enemies:
> . . . . . . . . . . .
> Thus have we swept Suspition from our Seate,
> And made our Footstoole of Security.
> . . . . . . . . . . . .
> Now am I seated as my soule delights. . . .
> (V, vii; 3172-3206)[15]

A speech Peele wrote for Queen Elinor in *King Edward the First* explains the impression throne of state should have made on the spectators of a royal drama in the Sixteenth Century:

I tell the Jone, what time our highnes sits,
Under our royall Canopie of state,
Glistering with pendants of the purest gold,
Like as our seate were spangled all with stars,
The world shall wonder at our majestie. . . .
(261-265)

Banners, ensigns, trumpets, thrones, and canopies were but a few of the royal trappings of the English court which the Tudor dramatist imitated to distinguish his kingly characters. The tent or pavilion was almost as important to the stage as the painted palace facade, because it could signify the king's royal estate abroad in his dominions or on the battlefield in war. Glynne Wickham, who has long made Tudor stagecraft the subject of scholarly study, believes that the royal tent was an extension of the canopied throne.[16] For the Tudor king play, the royal tent had advantages as a versatile scenic device, as we shall be noticing from time to time. George Peele availed himself of the tent to designate a royal home away from home. His Longshanks sits with his pages in a pavilion to receive the nobles and a bishop presenting him his baby son, the newly invested Prince of Wales (King Edward the First, 2141-2142). In the same play, Queen Elinor has a tent of her own which represents her chamber for the scenes in Wales.

Perhaps Richard Farrant was the poet who composed The Wars of Cyrus for the child actors of Her Majesty's Chapel during the 1570s.[17] Whoever was its author gave Araspas, a Persian nobleman, a speech describing an equisite royal tent at a military camp:

. . . there is a proud Assyrian tent
Wherein the king was wont to sleepe and banket in.
. . . . . . . . . . .
Asia hath not seen a richer prise.
The covering is of blew Sydonian silke,
Imbrodered all with pearle and precious stones;

> They glimmer brighter than the Sunne it selfe.
> On everie point of the pavilion
> There standes a princely top of Phenix plumes,
> Which, trickt with spangles and with silver belles,
> [At] everie gentle murmur of the winde
> Delights the day with everie harmonie.
> The stakes wherewith t'is fastened to the ground
> Are massie silver of the purest proofe;
> The ropes are all of chrimson silke and golde,
> Hung from the top with wrests of Ivorie.
> (I, i, 67-85)[18]

Apparently, the tent was pitched a safe distance from the front lines, because Araspas found it

> Under a Vine where Bacchus bruseth grapes,
> And twentie [Cupids] hover in the leaves. . . .
> (I, i, 86-87)

For the playgoer, such a splendid sight is only for the mind's eye. What the spectators actually see as the Persians search for spoil on the battlefield of the stage is "far from such a tent" -- a painted replica of the grandeur just described, wherein the player acting the Queen of Susa sits and sighs.

Duly announced with heralds and trumpet fanfares, entering with pomp and majesty, and ensconced in proper state upon his throne, the kingly persona of the drama also declared himself to the audience by the special regalia of his person. The description of the first act dumb show of George Gascoigne's and Francis Kinwelmersh's _Jocasta_ tells what Tudor audiences expected in the way of kingly costume and royal attributes. The first figure to enter is

> a king with an Imperial crown uppon his head, very richely apparelled: a Scepter in his righte hande, a Mounde with a Crosse in his lefte hande, sitting in a Chariote very richely furnished, drawne in by foure Kinges in their Dublettes and Hosen, with Crownes also upon their heades.
> (4-7)

The same attributes, imperial crown, scepter, "Mounde" or orb, belong to an ermine-robed king enthroned under a canopy, the subject of a woodcut on the title page of Mundus and Infans, an anonymous interlude which Wynkyn de Worde printed in 1522.[19] John Bale's Kyng Johan had a scepter among his other attributes of kingship (King Johan, A:1650).[20] According to the records of the Smith's Company in Coventry, scepters had to be provided for the King Herod of their pageant.[21]

But the crown was the stage king's supreme insignium, except in special situations the always visible symbol of majesty. Moreover, the kind of crown, imperial or a simple coronet, could indicate a king's relative status among other potentates and princely figures who might appear in the play. By itself, the crown could distinguish a king from the lords and commoners on the stage when he stepped down from his state, or left off his formal robes and other paraphernalia, to take part in the dramatic action. Ludus Coventriae's Herod, after riding into the playing place, changes his costume behind the curtain of his scaffold palace. When he emerges to preen, his crown -- in his case, an iron crest -- is still on his head:

> In kyrtyl of cammaka kynge am I cladde
> Cruel and curryd in myne crowne knowe
> I sytt here undyr sesar. . . .
>
> (18: 82-84)

Melchizar, one of the three Magi brought before this same Herod, identifies himself as a crowned king: "In tarys I am kynge with crowne" (18: 41). Herod speaks of the Magi as "gomys with gold crowns" (20: 13).

Once the crown begins to move from hand to hand, it is more than a piece of identifying costumery. The crown becomes a prop. "Enstall and Crowne her" is the stage direction (153) which makes Dorithea the queen of Scots in The Scottish History of James the Fourth, a play sometimes attributed to Robert Greene.[22] The climactic scene of The True Tragedy of Richard the Third is the battlefield coronation of the Earle Richmond as Henry VII. Richmond, his warriors, and their train enter with the crown (2034-2035). Lord Standley performs the ceremony:

> . . . then sit thou downe my sonne, and here receive the
> Crowne of England as thy proper owne, sit down.
> (2091-2093)

Deposition scenes likewise make the crown a prop. In King Johan, John Bale directs that "here þe kyng delevyr þe crowne to þe cardynall" (A: 1648).

The crown could take on even more significance than the throne, and serve several dramatic functions. Some dramatists invested the crown with manifold symbolic values around which the dramatic action developed. In the third act coronation scene of Alphonsus King of Aragon, Robert Greene's stage directions and speeches make the crown a stage property which conveys to its wearers a conditional royal dignity and territorial dominion. Here, Alphonsus is rewarding his supporters who have helped him defeat Belinus, King of Naples. The scene begins thus:

> Enter one, carrying two Crownes upon a Crest, Alphonsus,
> Albinius, Laelius and Miles, with their souldiers.
> (740-741)[23]

After a formal expression of gratitude, Alphonsus bids Laelius and Miles to sit down, according to protocol, and "receive [that], the which your swords have wonne" (777). Alphonsus crowns Laelius with the crown of Naples, entitling him to all Belinus' dominions. He then repeats the ceremony with the second crown, and Miles becomes the Duke of Milan with all the relevant appurtenances. Finally, Alphonsus takes the Crown of Aragon from his own head to reward Lord Albinius, saying, "Arise Albinius King of Aragon, Crowned by me. . ." (837-838). Thus the audience both sees and hears that three kings wear their crowns only by another king's will.

Besides the crown and robes of state, the Tudor stage king could wear clothing that made him noticeably grander than those around him. The Herod of the Coventry Shearmen and Taylors' pageant wore "gorgis araye" (511), and Ludus Coventriae's Herod rides into the playing place as, he says, the "comelyeste kynge clad in gleterynge golde" (18:9). He soon changes his apparel, putting on rings, robes and a "kyrtyl" of fine cloth (18: 69-82). The Magi who visit him have the "rych clothyng" proper to kings of degree (18: 296). Records of the Smiths Company of Coventry for the Tudor period show that the Herod of their pageant had a gown of satin and blue buckram, stained and painted by an artist hired for the purpose. His crest was painted in colours and flashed with gold or silver foil.[24] Fighting kings also were likely to appear in armour or "harness," like Hamlet's father's ghost and Richard III in Shakespeare's plays, and the wounded king in the fifth act dumbshow of Thomas Hughes's Misfortunes of Arthur.[25] But Jocasta's dumbshow has already indicated that royalty not seated in formal state could wear doublet and hose, although their rank is still marked by their crowns.

Usually the royal wardrobe needed to glitter, if not actually gleam with genuine gold, to make the kingly personage in a play the most dazzling sight of all. As one might expect, George Peele conjures a stunning costume for a king. In the coronation scene of King Edward the First, his Longshanks wears a suit of glass, the handiwork of the queen. She is understandably proud of it. Peele gives her a speech to describe the magnificent effect of its mosaic of mirrors when the king wears it:

> The welken spangled through with goulden spots,
> Reflects no finer in a frostie night,
> Then lovely Longshankes in his Elinors eye:
> So Ned thy Nell in every part of thee,
> Thy person's garded with a troope of Queenes,
> And every Queene as brave as Elinor,
> Give glorie to these glorious christall quarries,
> Where every robe an object entertaines,
> Of riche device and princelie majestie. . . .
> (764-772)

In A Looking-Glass for London and England, Thomas Lodge and Robert Greene clothe their royal characters in the finery of eloquence which heightens the effect of their visible costumes. Rasni, King of Ninivie, promises Remelia that

> Ile fetch from Albia shelves of Margarites,
> And strip the Indies of their Diamonds,
> And Tyre shall yeeld me tribute of her gold,
> To make Remelias wedding glorious. . . .
> (106-109)[26]

By and by, Remelia appears with her handmaids, "all in royaltie." She has a phoenix feather fan, she says. In her own estimation, her beauty is now comparable to that of the royalty of heaven:

> Tell me, is not my state as glorious
> As Junoes pomp, when tyred with heavens despoile,
> Clad in her vestments, spotted all with starres,

> She crossed the silver path unto her Jove,
> . . . . . . . . . . .
> My haires, surpasse they not Apollos locks,
> Are not my Tresses curled with such art. . . ?
> (428-436)

For the playwright who resorted to the report of offstage events, words alone could evoke the image of a majestic personage in bravery beyond the scope of the tiring house. In The Wars of Cyrus, Chrysandus envisions for the audience the spectacle of Cresus, the Lydian king, "Shining in armour forgde of Indian gold, Brave mounted on a prauncer of Eperus" (I, i, 16-17). Even a royal company of actors, then, with the considerable resources of the court at hand, might require a splendour for its king figures that only poetry could provide.

To be recognizable as a figure of royalty, the king in Tudor drama did more than look his part. He could speak in a princely manner to assert his sovereignty for himself. We shall now glance at a few ways in which the dramatists typically distinguished their king figures as sovereign rulers through their peculiar statements and commands.

Not every playwright wanted a king's approach heralded. Some dramatists let their royal figures announce themselves, asserting their rulership personally. That is the technique of the Ludus Coventriae dramatists. One of their Magi, riding through the playing place, declares:

> In ypotan And Archage
> I am kynge knowyn in kage
> to seke a childe of Semlant sage
> I have faryn ryght fferre
> Jasper is my name knowyn
> in many countres þat are my owyn.
> (18: 53-58)

In the same drama's Nativity episodes, Herod declares himself: "Now I regne. . .þe kynge" (18: 69). *Ludus Coventriae's* other Herod, he who conducts a trial of Jesus, proclaims himself ruler in this manner: "I am herowde of jewys • kyng most reverent" (29:5). Herodes, in the Candlemas Day play, Herod's *Killing of the Children*, is likewise his own spokesman:

> A-bove all kynges under Clowdys Cristall
> Royally I reigne. . . .
> . . . . . . . . . . .
> I Am kyng herowdes, • I will it be knowen soo.
> (I, 57-61)[27]

John Bale's Kyng Johan appears without other prologue to give the opening speech of the play:

> to shew what I am, I thynke yt convenyent
> Johan kyng of ynglond, þe cronyclys doth me call
> . . . . . . . . . . .
> I have worne the crown. . . .
> (*King Johan*, A: 8-18)

Some of the passages already quoted show that the royal character's own pronouncement of his sovereignty was also a chance to inventory his holdings and reveal the range of his power. The Herod in *Mary Magdalene* says his domains are "alapye, assye, and tyr. . . abyron [illegible]berȝaby, and bedlem" (I, iv, 158-159). Cambises rules a large and fertile soile," he says in *Cambyses King of Persia* (sig. A2$^{v}$). A poetic fervor inspires Rasni, the King of Ninivie, in Lodge's and Greene's *A Looking-Glass for London and England*, when he contemplates his empire:

> Am I not he that rules great *Ninivie*,
> Rounded with *Lycas* silver flowing streams,
> Whose Citie large *Diametri* containes,
> Even three daies journies length from wall to wall,

> Two hundreth gates carved out of burnisht brasse,
> As glorious asthe portoyle of the Sunne,
> And for to decke heavens battlements with pride,
> Six hundreth Towers that toplesse touch the cloudes:
> This Citie is the footestoole of your King. . . .
> (12-20)

The stage king's claims to territory and power sometimes went beyond the limits of ordinary human realms. As Lodge's and Greene's King Rasni grows expansive, he assumes a degree of divine power:

> Great Jewries God that foiled stout Benhadab.
> Could not rebate the strength that Rasni brought,
> For he be God in heaven, yet Viceroyes know,
> Rasni is God on earth and none but he.
> (27-30)

Others, especially Herods, frequently claimed larger than earthly sway, and in Mary Magdalene Tiberius Caesar purports to be "chyff rewlar" of heaven and hell (I, i, 5).

The statements of rightful succession which a Tudor playwright allowed his kingly characters represent a concern distinctive of royalty. In Cambyses King of Persia, Preston has the king derive his line of authority from his father:

> You know that Mors vanquished hath Cirus that king of state.
> And I by due inheritance possesse that princely crown.
> Ruling by sword of mighty force in place of great renowne.
> (sig. A2$^{v}$)

John Bale marshals a grandfather who was "an emperowr excelent," besides a royal father and brother for his Kyng Johan's "successyon lyneall" (King Johan, A: 10-12). Tiberius Caesar, in Mary Magdalene, hints vaguely that lineal descent legitimates his reign, too:

> I am þe blod ryall most of soverente;
> of all emperowers and kynges my byrth is best.
> (I, i, 10-11)

Shakespeare was inclined to put a royal figure's claims to rightful succession in the mouth of another character. So, in *1 Henry VI,* II, v, the dying Mortimer recounts his own royal pedigree before his heir, the Duke of York, who eventually claims the throne of England. In *Henry V,* at the king's request for just advice, the Archbishop of Canterbury explicates the Salic law at great length and invokes mighty ancestors so that Henry may, "with right and conscience," make his claim to France (I, ii).

Tudor playwrights customarily distinguished their princely figures from other personae by making them treat others as their subjects. Kings on the stage commanded obedience. Sometimes they were models of courtesy, like Shakespeare's King Harry: "My learned Lord, we pray you to proceed. ..." (*Henry V*, I, ii, 156). Sometimes they were as abrupt as Queen Margaret ordering "Off with his Head" (*3 Henry VI,* I, iv, 648). Thomas Preston gave an imperious manner to an irascible king in *Cambyses King of Persia:*

> No more adoe, go fetch me him, it shalbe as I say:
> And if that I doo speak the word, now dare ye once say naye.
> . . . . . . . . . . .
> Is he gone: now by the Gods I will do as I say.
> (sig. C4 $^r$)

The spectators are the subjects of Tiberius Caesar in *Mary Magdalene*:

> I command sylens in þe peyn of forfetur,
> to all myn audyeans present general.
> (I, i, 1-2)

But here is the King of Marcylle demanding obeisance in the same play:

> A-wantt, a-want ʒe, on-worthy wrecchesse!
> Why lowtt ʒe nat low to my lawdabyll presens,
> ye brawlyng breelles, and blabyr-lyppyd bycchys.
> (II, 21, 925-927)

In King Edward the First, Peele shows how a king should speak to his barber:

> Come sirra cutte me close unto the chinne,
> And round me even seest thou by a dishe,
> Leave not a locke. . . .
>
> (1837-1839)

Royal decorum could prevail among Tudor stage kings even for lovemaking, when the royal pronoun was sometimes useful for commanding affection. This is how King Assuerus addressed his wife in Godly Queen Hester, an interlude based on Scripture:

> O goodly Hester our most noble Quene,
> Of personage pearles and in wisdome alone,
> In corage and countenaunce none lyke is seene,
> So discrete in dallyance was never none,
> where is your comfort, care can bee none,
> Loe. . . approch nere to this place,
> That we may kisse you, and in our armes embrace.
>
> Here thei kysse
>
> (869-875)

Another category of evidence of a dramatic persona's royal status is other characters' recognition of him as king. Tudor playwrights had a ready supply of conventions to make royalty's underlings show respect for their rulers in both speech and visible deportment.

Characters of lesser rank often spoke of the king figure as a "peereless prince," or "most drad soveraigne." Sisamnes, a prudent judge, approaches royalty in Preston's Cambyses King of Persia, with these words: "Oh puissant prince & mighty king, the Gods preserve your grace" (sig. A3 $^{v}$). When an Oriental potentate arrives on stage in The Wars of Cyrus, his nobles salute him with his titles: "Antiochus, king of Assiria,/ So Lord of Euphrates and Babylon" (II, i, 1-2). Herod's messenger in the Coventry Shearmen and Taylors' pageant greets his master in this fashion:

> Hayle, kynge, most worthist in wede!
> Hayle, manteinar of curtese throgh all this world wyde!
> Hayle, the most myghtyst that eyver bestrod a stede!
> Ha[y]ll, most monfullist monn in armor man to abyde!
> Hayle, in thyne hoonowre!
> (768-772)

Such outbursts seem extravagant, yet the proper formulas for addressing make-believe royalty were not very different from those used to speak to the living sovereign. In Nicholas Trotte's introduction to Hughes's The Misfortunes of Arthur, played before Queen Elizabeth at Greenwich in 1588, two stage characters address the royal spectator seated in the hall. She is to them a "gratious Queene" (1), and "Soveraigne Lady of our lawes and us" (108). Trotte concludes the second speech as a respectful subject should, with a compliment to his monarch:

> . . . For that since your sacred Majestie
> In gratious hands the regall Scepter held
> All Tragedies are fled from State, to stadge.
> (131-133)

Good Queen Hester is right when she says, "To speake before a king, it is no childes play" (Godly Queen Hester, 269).

In Tudor plays, a ruler's subjects visibly demonstrated their respect for kingly rank. Usually, kneeling before the sovereign was a sufficient display of courtesy in the royal presence, but some dramatists made much of this conventional device. In The Wars of Cyrus, a nobleman seeking mercy for an offence approaches his king thus:

> My sovereigne Lord, in trembling feare I stay,
> And prostrate fall before your highnesse feete.
> (IV, iii, 1258-1259)

A commoner begging an audience grovels even lower when approaching royalty in Cambyses, King of Persia:

Redoubted Prince and mighty king, my self I prostrat heere:
Vouchsafe (O king) with me to beare, for this that I appeere.
With humble sute I pardon crave, of your most royall grace:
To give me leave my minde to break, before you in this place.
(sig. C1$^{r}$)

Not all of Herod's subjects knelt before him. A stage direction from Ludus Coventriae requires his scaffold to unclose, "shewing herowdes in astat all þe jewys knelyng • except Annas and cayphas þei xal stondyn" (29:356).

Occasionally, a playwright made his characters actively willing to perform a princely command. Here is Herod's messenger in the Coventry Shearmen and Taylors' pageant responding to the king's call:

Lorde, I am redde att youre byddyng
To sarve the ase my lord and kyng:
For joye there-of, loo, how I spryng
With lyght hart and fresche gamboldyng
Alofte here on this molde!
(622-626)

More abject is a councillor in Cambyses King of Persia answering his ruler's request for advice:

Oh puisant king, your blisful words deserves abundant praise,
. . . . . . . . . . . .
Sure my true and soveraigne king, I fall before you prest,
Answere to give as dutie mine, in that your grace request.
(sig. A2$^{v}$)

Two kinds of situation were especially useful to Tudor dramatists in distinguishing kings from other characters because they inherently involved the recognition of a persona's sovereign status in ways which could be expressed in the spectacle and action of the play. The first of these characteristically royal situations is the encounter of king figures with each other. When kings met kings in Tudor plays they might recognize each other's status. In the Coventry Shearmen and Taylors' pageant, as in other dramas, a king addresses those of equal rank by title. The Magi so address each other, and also talk among themselves as "brothers." Herod, in a friendly vein for the moment, addresses their spokesman as his brother.

But sometimes a royal figure declines to recognize another's claim to sovereignty. According to whether princely characters possessed a realm or craved to gain one, there were two sets of terms for them to use when they met. Upon these terms, which always identified the speaker as a legitimate ruler and his opponent as a pretender, Tudor playwrights elaborated the dialogue. To the one prince, the other is a traitor and a rebel; to the second, the first is a traitor and a usurper. A scene where the King of England and his men face the Prince of Wales and his supporters on the walls, from George Peele's King Edward the First, supplies passages to illustrate the point:

> Longshanks. Where is the proude disturber of our state?
> Traitor to Wailes, and to his soveraigne.
>
> Lluellen. Usurper here I am what doost thou crave.
>
> Longshanks. Welshman alleagance which thou owest thy king.
>
> Lluellen. Traitor, no king, that seekes thy countries sack,
> The famous runnagate of Christendome.
>
> Longshanks. Ambitious rebell, knowest thou what I am,
> How great, how famous, and how fortunate,
> And darst thou carie armes against me here,
> Even when thou shouldst do reverence at my feete?
> . . . . . . . . . . .
> Traitor, this sworde unsheathd hath shined oft,
> With reeking in . . . bloud. . . .
> . . . . . . . . . . .
> Disloiall villaine thou. . . .
> (904-928)

Gift-giving is another kind of situation distinctive of royal affairs, one which identifies king figures as having sovereign status.

A Tudor stage king could receive magnificent gifts signifying the donor's acknowledgement of his sovereignty. Among themselves, royalty exchanged presents betokening mutual esteem. We saw earlier, in Peele's King Edward the First, something of a queen's gift of shining raiment to her royal consort. A globe seated in a ship comes onstage in Lodge's and Greene's A Looking-Glass for London and England (72); it is a present to the "mightiness" of King Rasni of Ninivie from his concubine. To the Herod of the Coventry Shearmen and Taylors' pageant, the offerings of "gold, rychesse, and mede" (791) he expects to get from others will be proofs of his supremacy. Ludus Coventriae's Herod promises the Magi "gold and tresour and rych wede/ with furrys rych and wurth pelle," if they return his way (18: 197-198).

A species of the royal gift-giving convention is the king's distribution of largess to his subjects. Peele formalizes a princely gift to commoners in his King Edward the First where Longshanks founds a veterans' college to shelter his wounded soldiers. The king's contribution, however, is only the beginning of a dignified scramble to benefit the soldiery. To extract donations from his retinue, Longshanks addresses his noble companions one by one, asking each to name his "benevolence." The prompt and generous response of the nobility is a measure of their recognition of Longshanks's rightful power and sovereignty (137-206). Longshanks is also one of the stage monarchs who sees that the servant who brought him news of his son's birth should not go empty-handed (1259-1262).

One form of royal largess which some Tudor playwrights liked to dramatize to show a princely character's sovereign status is his bestowal of power on others. Watkin, Herod's messenger in Herod's Killing of the Children, receives from his king the promise of a knighthood should he be diligent in the massacre (215-216). Before departing for the battlefield, the king in Cambyses King of Persia appoints a judge to rule in his stead. This is how Thomas Preston makes Sisamnes express his changed status, which has brought him royal powers and privileges:

> Even now the King hath me extold, and set me up aloft,
> Now may I weare the bordred guard and lie in downe bed soft,
> Now may I purchase house and land, and have all at my wil,
> Now may I build a princely place, my mind for to fulfil.
> Now may I abrogate the law, as I shall thinke it good,
> If any one me now offend, I may demaund his blood.
> (sig. A4$^{r-v}$)

But the banquet was the expression of royal largess appealing most deeply to the imagination of the Tudor dramatist. The playwrights made the banquet virtually a distinguishing mark of stage royalty. The stage feast, at which a princely figure presided, surrounded by his noble guests, was an occasion for spectacle, action, and the delights of colour and sound, all produced at the command of the king. The severities of Sixteenth Century classical drama may have denied the propriety of banquet scenes, but English playwrights worked them into their royal drama somehow. Thomas Hughes directed that the third act dumbshow for his Senecan Misfortunes of Arthur should have two gentlemen, "attyred in peaceable manner," come on stage to set up a banquet with table, carpet, cloth, dishes, and burning incense. Nor could many playwrights for the popular stage resist a royal banquet scene. If they could not bring a feast right on stage, they alluded to banquets just in the offing, even as an excuse for the king to call for music.

There were as many variations on the royal banquet as there were poets to invent them. The Coventry Shearmen and Taylors' Herod tries to lure the Magi into his power with an invitation to a feast. "You schall tryomfe in this cuntre," he promises them, "And with grett conquorde bankett with me. . . " (660-661). Ludus Coventriae's Herod plays the host at a feast celebrating the Massacre of Innocents. In Godly Queen Hester, the queen invites her royal husband to a banquet set out in the playing place. The invitation is expressed in the form of a long-winded plea for a boon:

> Noble prince and our espouse most deare,
> Since that to aske ye have geven me libertie,
> I besech your grace, with heart most entier
> That it may please you this day to dine with me.
> (878-881)

King Assuerus wastes no words: "Call us in Aman that we may go in haste" (884).

Thomas Preston squeezes three variations of the royal banquet into his Cambyses King of Persia. One is the royal carouse. The king has been plying his good store of wine in the palace, and he drinks off two big cupfuls on stage. Next, Preston gives Ambidexter the Vice a chance to recall the merry-making during the king's wedding, which included a "banquet royall" upon which "thousands, and thousands" were spent (sig. E4 $^{r}$). In a moment Ambidexter comes upon a palace servant laying the cloth and bringing in dainties for a more intimate feast for the King, the Queen, and their train.

The theatrical techniques Tudor dramatists commonly used to display and identify the king as a special figure in the play belonged to all who practised stagecraft in those times. The playwright borrowed freely from the ceremony surrounding the English monarch. He tried to imitate for his audience his own prince's grandeur and his style. Like George Gascoigne's servant who remains in front of Jocasta's palace to describe the marvels taking place within, the dramatist sought to reproduce for his audiences

> The golden glosse that outwardly appeares,
> The crownes bedeckt with pearle and precious stones,
> The riche attire imbost with beaten golde,
> The glittering mace, the pompe of swarming traine,
> The mightie halles heapt full of flattering frendes,
> The chambers huge, the goodly gorgeous beddes,
> The gilted roofes embowde with curious worke,
> The faces sweete of fine disdayning dames. . . .
> (Jocasta, I, i, 224-231)

The results for the drama were either shabby or sumptuous, according to the playing company's means or the dramatist's intent and skill. But whether used to distinguish the living king from his subjects or to mark the presence of majesty in a play, the techniques of identifying a sovereign personage were, to the Tudor audience, conventional and obvious. Because those techniques were basic to the Tudor dramatic art of portraying royalty, awareness of them leads to an appreciation of the ingenuity of the playwrights who used them. It was from such devices, readily recognized by the audience, that the playwrights, as poets and artists, wrought the fascinating royal personalities and effigies that enlivened English drama from 1485, when Henry VII ascended the English throne, until Queen Elizabeth I died in 1603.

One survey of the main dramatic techniques by which Tudor playwrights distinguished royalty on stage from other characters is now complete. The next chapter will show how the dramatists used some of the same techniques to give the appearance of majesty to other kinds of characters besides kings properly so-called. We shall also come to see how these "quasi-kings," as they might be described, were useful to the Tudor dramatist in delineating the "character" of the ordinary kings in their plays.

# Chapter II

The characterization of king figures in Tudor drama is entangled with the knotty problem of other kinds of power besides conventional royal rule, and with the presence of personae other than ordinary kings who may bear some marks of royalty described in Chapter I. Tudor dramatists do not always make it easy to distinguish one kind of majestic persona from another. Usually the confusion derives from a concept of royalty understandable only in the context of each play. Since the processes by which the dramatists created their royal characters resist neat categories, an arbitrary classification of "true" king figures and "others" could be misleading for a drama's sense.

Nevertheless, many dramatists composed portraits of royalty by juxtaposing more than one kind of sovereign figure in a play, or by fusing the characteristics of several kinds. Because figures of extraordinary sovereignty suggest limits to the power of ordinary kings, we are obliged to examine the main lines of the dramatic practice of giving royal attributes to characters who are not, properly speaking, kings.

For the convenience of discussion, we can distinguish at the outset three general categories of Tudor stage figures who are not ordinarily regarded as sovereign rulers in a social sense, but whom dramatists sometimes treated as royalty to indicate their authoritative power. These characters of extraordinary majesty are, first, the magnificos and the great lords, often called dukes; secondly, the personifications of abstract ideas; and finally, a large and diverse group of supernatural figures, chiefly traditional deities and divine personae, demonic characters, and fairies. The appearance of such characters in Tudor royal drama expresses notions current in Renaissance England that other powers besides royalty held sway over mortal men. Untitled personages, nobles of less than kingly rank, divine beings, evil influences, magic, abstract ideas, and even the agents of these "authorities," might determine human actions, and sometimes the affairs of kings.

Whether they defined the scope of ordinary princes' powers, or whether their subject kings simply amplified their higher rule, these extraordinary sovereign figures contributed fascinating details to the portraits of royalty in Tudor plays. Some of their contributions are subjects of discussion in chapters further on. For the moment, we have one main piece of business with them: to survey those procedures of the playwrights in making them majestic which could complicate the characterization of ordinary kings.

One of the devices for characterizing royalty is the practice of allowing ordinary kings to imitate the characteristics of personae with extraordinary powers. Another practice is to make ordinary kings claim extraordinary powers, as Lodge's and Greene's King Rasni purports to be a kind of god. Still a third device is to give different attributes of royalty to both ordinary kings and extraordinary powers in the same play. Finally, some dramatists would so infuse a figure of extraordinary majesty with the social characteristics of ordinary royalty that the character seems imitative of mortal kings instead of being an object of emulation himself.

Of this last category, Wisdom is a convenient example. This personified abstraction representing divine intelligence in the Digby play, Wisdom, colours his speech with royal and civil terminology which is the dramatist's addition to his source, a work of mystical devotion.[1] Similarly, in The Play of the Weather, John Heywood has written many of his Jupiter's speeches in rhyme royal stanzas, a verse form frequently employed by courtly poets for English royal pageantry.[2] Such novel treatments confuse the interpretation of the extraordinary princely characters as pure abstractions or as wholly fabulous figures, especially when we give consideration to the other specific techniques of marking royalty which the dramatists of those characters employed.

In part, a Tudor dramatist gave his "quasi-kings" some of the same marks of sovereign status that he used to distinguish his ordinary figures of royalty from lesser mortals in the play because the conventional attributes of royalty as depicted on the stage are symbolic of power in general. The techniques described in Chapter I for identifying princely personae, therefore, are as useful for "royalizing" other kinds of characters as they are for defining conventional kingly rank as a social estate and position of power. The problem for the dramatist who wanted to distinguish his ordinary king figure from a character of ordinary majesty was to handle the same set of conventions in noticeably different ways. The rest of this chapter is devoted to examples, following the order set out in Chapter I, of the principle conventions of marking royalty as Tudor dramatists used them to royalize extraordinary figures of power.

As everybody knows, allusions in Tudor drama to the sovereignty of Christian deities over heaven and earth conform to ancient church doctrines, ritual, and artistic conventions.[3] The allusions derive ultimately from the Scriptural tradition that Christ was King of the Jews, and from the imagery of the Gospels, as well as from the imperial style of Roman emperors. But the Tudor playwrights dramatized divine sovereignty with much the same theatrical devices that they used to distinguish conventional secular royalty from the rest of society. Furthermore, they also used many of those techniques to give majesty to the other kinds of "quasi-royalty" besides divine personae. The illustrations here are intended to show something of the versatility of the dramatic artist in adapting conventional techniques.

As the Tudor dramatist could herald the entry of an ordinary king, so could he prepare for the appearance of a figure of extraordinary majestic power. In fact, a good deal of the spectacle and action of the great cycle plays in England is devoted solely to preparing the audience for the coming of Jesus as the Heavenly King. By the late Fifteenth Century, the theatrical techniques employed to increase the excitement and anticipation leading up to the arrival of Christ on the scene had evolved into a highly complex set of conventions, which, for all their traditional elements, were subject to individual treatments by dramatic artists of ingenuity.

In The Chester Plays, one of the earliest presentiments the audience gets of Jesus' coming occurs in the fourth pageant dramatizing events of Abraham's life. Abraham has pleased God by making a proper offering in the preferred manner, and his reward is the promise of a son. Moreover, Abraham's posterity is to increase in honour. An Expositor explains:

> This deed you se done in this place,
> In example of Jhesu done yt was,
> that [for to wyn] mankind grace
> was sacrifised on the rode.
>
> By Abraham I may understand
> the father of heaven that can fand
> With his sonnes blood to break that band
> the Devil had brought us too.
>
> By Isaac understand I may
> Jhesu that was obedyent aye,
> his fathers will to worke alway,
> his death to underfonge.
>
> (IV, 465-476)[4]

Isaac is thus a "type" of Christ, sometimes called an antetype, one of a like kind who goes before. Like the announcement that a king is on the way, or a preparatory scene before his entry, the antetype or prefiguration anticipates the appearance of a majestic character later on, giving him, in advance, the "historical" importance due a figure of sovereign powers.

Nor is this all. The Chester dramatists additionally prepare for the arrival of majestic divinity by staging a procession of eight prophets, much like a regal procession, who make formal speeches of this sort about the coming Christ:

> Balaam
>
> He shall overcome and have in band
> All kinges, dukes of strang land,
> . . . . . . . . . . .
>
> (V, 293-294)
>
> Micheas
>
> . . . man shall sothlie finde
> that a Childe of kinges kinde
> in Bethlem shall be borne. . . .
>
> (V, 394-396)

The whole treatment is reminiscent of royal street pageantry, the prophecies serving to herald with impressive dignity the arrival of Christ whose birth is dramatized in the next pageant, The Nativity (VI).

In the same drama, a demonic figure has his heralds, too, a parade of prophets who, with another Expositor to help, announces the coming Antichrist, a king and great lord over other kings (XXII, 154-168), whose pageant is to follow. However, little glory attends this strange character's entry, because he is only a temporary power, one whose wicked reign merely anticipates a still greater event, the second coming of the Christ.

Characters endowed with extraordinary powers also needed retinues to express the supremacy of their estate. Heywood's Jupiter acquires his "train" of one, Merry Report, a vice who acts as his factotum in The Play of the Weather. The Chester Plays' Lucifer has his follower in Lightburne (I, 173). Mundus' retinue of "virtuous" followers in Mundus and Infans are seven lesser kings whom he bids his vassal, Manhood, to "worship":

> One of them is the kynge of pryde
> The kynge of envy dougty in dede
> The kynge of wrathe that boldely wyll abyde
> For mykyll is his myght.
>
> (sig. A4 r)

The kings of covetousness, sloth, gluttony and lechery make up the rest of his "meny," so that, could we see Mundus arrayed in full estate he would be presiding over the Seven Deadly Sins. Unfortunately for us, his tributaries do not come on stage.

Shepherds and kings form an early retinue for the Christ Child in The Chester Plays, a function taken over later by the Disciples, Martha, and Mary Magdalena. Chester's Deus Pater creates his own retinue, "neene orders of Angells," to be ranged below him in "Celestyall safetye" (I, 24-26). He determines their order of precedence in forming a council:

> . . . sithe I have formed you so fayre
> And exalted yow so exellent,
> And here I sett you next my Chayre,
> My love to you is so fervent.
>
> (I, 65-68)

His "principall lord" describes the hierarchical arrangement of those attending:

> Cherubyn and Seraphyn throughe your thoughte,
> Trones and Domynacions in blisse to bee,
>
> With principatus, that order brighte,
> And potestates in blisseful heighte;
> Also virtutes through thy great mighte,
> Angeli, also Archangeli.
>
> (I, 31-36)

The council of state that is such a prominent feature of the dramatization of king figures could also be adapted to figures of extraordinary power. In Ludus Coventriae's Parliament of Heaven, Ffilius, a figure of Christ, calls a "councel of trinitie" (11: 171), after a council of the Four Daughters of God gives conflicting advice. The summit conference, so to speak, results in an embassy of Gabriel to the Virgin Mary for the Annunciation, prelude to the coming of the "King over Kings." When John Heywood's Jupiter alludes to the lesser deities in his pantheon as his "hye parlyament" (sig. A2 r), which must agree to the surrender of its power to its chief, the combination of divine and royal councils acquires overtones of an assembly of the Olympian gods in Westminster (The Play of the Weather, sig. A3 r).

Thrones and high places elevate to majestic importance many "quasi-king" figures in Tudor drama. When Shakespeare's *Titus Andronicus* begins, Senators and Tribunes are ensconced in the upper left which represents the throne room of Imperial Rome's Senate House. The elevation of those lordly characters, moments before an emperor is to be crowned, implies that they hold sway over the seat of earthly power and majesty, and hence over the ruler-to-be. In *The Chester Plays*, Deus is elevated "*in supremo loco*" (V, 136-137), a position expressly higher than the Mount Sinai represented in the playing place, a prominence shared by Moses and King Balaack (V, 88). A stage direction in Lodge's and Greene's *A Looking-Glass for London and England* calls for an angel to bring in Oseas the Prophet, an agent of God who is "set down over the stage in a throne" (159-160), a device which visibly superimposes a superior rule over the lesser realm of King Rasni on the boards below. In *The Play of the Weather*, John Heywood lets Jupiter have music in his throne, a retreat into which he withdraws his "godly presens" during part of the play (sig. A4$^{r}$).

The regal splendour the playwrights could require for costuming figures other than ordinary royalty is apparent in the stage directions prefixed to *Wisdom*:

> ffyrst entreth Wysdam in a ryche purpyll cloth of gold, with a mantyll of the same ermyned within, havying a-bought his nek a ryall hood furred with ermyn. upon his hed a cheveler with browes, a berd of gold of Sypres [spires] curled. A ryche Imperiall crowne ther-upon, set with riche stonys and perlys. In his left hand a ball of gold with a crosse þer-upon, And in his right hond A regall Sceptre. . . .
>
> (I, Stage Direction)

Chapter I mentioned the woodcut on the title-page of Mundus and Infans, picturing a king in full formal regalia, seated on a throne under a canopy. The play makes it clear that the king figure is supposed to be Mundus himself, although he is the personification of an abstract idea. Enthroned in his heavenly court, The Chester Plays' Deus Pater regally outshines his vassals (I, 95). The beams of his bright face "be all beatytude" (I, 9), and are a source of the beauty of his courtiers (I, 38). When the magnifico, Cyrus, in Mary Magdalene, brags about his resplendent person "glysterying in gold," he sounds a little like King Herod (I, ii, 53).

The crown, of course, signified the majesty, not only of kings but of any figure who wore it. The Cappers' Company of Coventry provided crowns for the Three Maries in plays about the Resurrection, and paid for scouring them up for performances. The Cappers' angels and their Virgin Mary also wore crowns.[5] Figures representing popes might be crowned in the plays in which they appeared, as we can guess from the remarks of Sedycyon in John Bale's King Johan:

> What: . . . ye are owr pope
> Where is yowr thre crounys, your crosse keys & yowr cope.
> (A: 833-834)

Usurpid Power returns during the next episode to play the part of an historical pope (A: 1002), and it is likely that he dresses to fit Sedycyon's description, and wears a triple crown or tiara. The Ludus Coventriae dramatists associated the crown with the Christ child, at least in words, if not also in costume or decor. When ordering his knights to kill the baby boys of Judea, Herod says:

> One of hem alle
> Was born in stalle

ffolys hym calle
kynge in crowne.

(20: 49-52)

It is largely from their handling of the kingly regalia and royal state that the Chester dramatists derive the moving pathos of the unworldly king in a worldly situation. The Jews mock Jesus by dressing him in a travesty of the royal garments and attributes:

Now since he king is,
quaynt his clothing is;
Begger, to thee I bringe this,
for this thou shalt bear.

(The Chester Plays,
XVI, 329-332)

They crown Jesus with thorns, give him a scepter of reeds, kneel before him with obscene gestures, and anoint him with spittle. Perhaps a stool is his throne (Ludus Coventriae, 29: 160-161). Pilate jeers:

lordinges, here you may see
your kinge all in his royalty!

(XVI, 361-362)

The Chester dramatists finally bring their Jesus into his true majesty. Robed in red to commemorate his excruciating sufferings on earth, he ascends to Heaven. Now he is "Comely. . . in his clothinge" (XX, 109). Saints form his retinue (XX, 111), and angels sing his praises. The disciples below gaze with wonder at the transformation of their sovereign. Christ has "proved his Deitie" (180), and, as Jacobus Major observes:

Yea, also by his upstayinge
he seemes fully heaven Kinge.

(XX, 181-182)

Statements and commands similar to those characterizing ordinary stage royalty distinguish extraordinary figures of majesty in

Tudor king plays. Divine characters appear in majesty and claim high sovereignty. "I God, most in majesty" (II, 1) is a typical utterance of the Deus Pater of The Chester Plays. Styling himself a "Peareles Patron Imperiall," he insists upon his princely nature in a long opening speech which has a few points in common with Herod's proclamations:

> For all the mighte of the majestye is magnified in me,
> Prince principall proved in my perpetuall prudens.
> . . . . . . . . . . .
> These three tryalls in a Trone and true Trynitie
> Be grounded in my godhead. . . .
> the mighte of my making is marked all in me,
> dissolved under a Dyademe by my divyne experyence.
> (I, 13-20)

He, too, describes his dominions:

> Now sithe I am thus solemne and set in my solation
> a biglie blisse here will I builde, a heaven without ending,
> and cast a Comlye compasse by my comely creation.
> (I, 21-23)

Ludus Coventriae's Deus begins in a similar vein: "My name is knowyn god and kynge" (I: 1). Cyrus, the magnifico of Mary Magdalene, never gets the title of king. But in the royal style of declaring his authority he claims that emperors, kings, conquerors, earls, barons, and knights are to him but "Berdes in my bower" (I, ii, 49-51). On the other hand, when the fairy Oberon asserts his sovereignty, rather casually, in The Scottish History of James the Fourth, he calls himself a king:

> Bohan. But what were those Puppits that hopt and skipt about me year whayle?
>
> Oberon. My subjects.
>
> Bohan. Thay subjects, whay art thou a king?
>
> Oberon. I am.
>
> (I, Prologue, 19-23)

In his assertion of rulership, Mundus, the abstract figure who dominates the interlude, Mundus and Infans, is nearly as prolix as God in The Chester Plays:

> Syrs seace of your sawes what so befall
> And loke ye bow bonerly to my byddyng
> For I am ruler of realmes I warne you all
> And over all fodys I am kynge
> For I am kynge and well knowen in these realmes rounde.
> (sig. A1$^{r}$)

Mundus calls himself a "prynce peryllous" (sig. A4$^{r}$) to whom emperors and ordinary kings kneel. He enumerates his elegant possessions and inventories his dominions, as regular Tudor stage kings often do. In fact, that device explains his title and the abstraction he represents:

> For all the [w] orld I wote well is my name:
> All rychesse redely it renneth in me
> All pleasure worldely bothe myrthe and game
> . . . . . . . . . . .
> For I am the worlde I warne you all
> Prynce of powere and of plente
> He that cometh not whan I do hym call
> I shall hym smyte with poverte
> . . . . . . . . . . .
> I am a kynge in every case
> Me thynketh I am a god of grace.
> (sig. A1$^{v}$)

Wisdom launches into the prologue of his play, Wisdom, to declare his "nayme imperyall" and his noble worth (2-4).

The Chester Plays' demonic figure of Antichrist (sometimes called Antechrist because he "comes before" Christ's manifestation at Doomsday) is, by his own declaration a king over other kings (XXII, 154-168). He asserts his power and majesty in pompous Latin:

> De celso Throno Poli, pollens clarior Sole,
> age, vobis monstrare descendi, vos Judicare;
> Reges, et Principes, sunt Subditi sub me viventes;

Sitis Sapientes vos, semper in me credentes. . . .
(XXIII, 1-4)

He rules the Jews, he says (XXIII, 33), and in purporting to be their promised Saviour, he assumes the power of the divine:

Messias, Christ, and most of might,
that in the law was you beheight,
All mankynd joy to dight,
is comen, for I am he.
(XXIII, 13-16)

When Lucifer, in the same cycle, seizes the "chayre" of sanctified power, he at once assumes the royal style, declaring his majesty in familiar terms:

Above great God I will me guyde,
And set my self here, as I wene:
I am pereles and the prince of pryde.
for God him self shynes not so sheene.
(I, 161-164)

The Chester Plays' Satan opens his pageant, The Temptation, by proclaiming his kingliness:

Now by my soverayntie I sweare
and principalitie that I beare. . . .
(XII, 1-2)

Jesus' assertion of sovereignty is at issue in the most intense dramatic conflict of The Chester Plays, the Passion leading up to the Crucifixion. Among his Disciples, Jesus affirms only his royal parentage. The purpose of his miracles, he says, is to glorify "my father inmagesty" (XV, 237). The gathering emotional intensity of the episodes leading to the Crucifixion is founded on the repeated endeavors of Jesus' enemies to force from him a statement of his own kingship. Pilate demands of the prisoner:

What sayest thou, mon in misse aray?
and thou be Kinge of Jewes, say.
(XVI, 145-146)

Jesus is non-committal:

> So thou sayes, as men heare may,
> a kinge that thou me mase.
>
> (XVI, 147-148)

King Herod also wants to know "giff thou from god in majesty/ be commen"(XVI, 179-180). But Jesus answers him with silence. Before Pilate again, the same question is put: "Art thou kinge, say for all ther cry" (XVI, 269). Finally, Jesus declares the nature of his kingship: "My realme in this world, as say I, / is not. . ." (XVI, 270-271). Pilate concludes: "Ergo a king thou arte or was" (XVI, 281).

Royalty's conventional preoccupation with the legitimacy of succession was a device dramatists adapted to other kinds of stage characters to enhance the impression of their majesty. Mary Magdalene's Cyrus is much absorbed in matters of succession and posterity, a customary interest of royalty. While still in sound mind, he makes his will, dividing up his domains in the presence of the heirs who will succeed to his power. To Lazarus goes the Lordship of Jerusalem; to Martha, Bethany; to Mary, the Castle of Maudleyn (I, ii).

Much is made in Ludus Coventriae of the ancient custom of proving a sacerdotal lineage by means of the Root of Jesse. Radix Jesse is even a character in a regal procession of both prophets and kings, who, one by one, vouch for the derivation from David of the Virgin Mary and her son, Jesus (7: 17). The credentials of these two divine characters are thereby equally holy and royal, a point reiterated in the episode of Christ and the Doctors. The young Jesus expounds his genealogy to explain his "wytt of so hyȝ cognysion" (21: 63):

I am of dobyl byrth and of dobyl lenage
Ffyrst be my fadyr I am with-out gynnynge
And lyke as he is hendeles in his hyȝ stage
So xal I also nevyr mor have endynge.

Ffor be my ffadyr kynge celestyal
With-out begynnyng I am endles.
but be my modyr þat is carnall
I am but xij ȝere of age. . . .

(21: 157-164)

Some margins of Ludus Coventriae's manuscript are filled with royal genealogies of the tribal variety found in the Old Testament. They are inscribed in an ornamental hand, as if to guide the making of banderoles and scenic displays for performances (3: 61; 4: 30, 62; 7: 134 f.; 8: Prologue, 25).

The dramatists of the Coventry Shearmen and Taylors' pageant also used the figure of the prophet to testify as to the respectable origins of a figure extraordinary majesty. But they had an elliptical approach to the matter. A lone prophet who is the prologue prays for the "right rote" to spring in Israel (9), to bring the good people into his kingdom (12). Later, after the birth of Jesus, two more prophets appear to proclaim news of the "natevete of a kyng" coming from "thatt reygend ryall and mighty mancion" (343-345).

As ordinary stage kings demand obedience of their minions, so do figures of extraordinary royalty in Tudor king plays. In Heywood's The Play of the Weather, Jupiter orders Merry Report to select the most worthy suitors for his favours, and to "bryng them before our majeste" (sig. A4$^r$). The Chester Plays' Deus Pater includes a threat in his commands to his celestial courtiers:

> Looke, ye touche not my trone by non assent.
> All your bewty I shall apayre,
> And pride fall ought in your intent.
> (I, 69-72)

In the Creation episode, he utters other commands indicative of sovereign power: "At my bydding now be made light!" (II, 9). He wills living things to appear in his presence, and orders them to multiply (II, 65). Lucifer, in the usurped throne of Deus Pater, demands that the angels do him homage:

> Here will I sit now in this stid,
> to exalt my selfe in this same sea;
> behold my body, both handes and head!
> the might of god is marked in me.
> All Angelles turne to me, I redd,
> And to your Soveraigne knele on your knee!
> I am your Comfort, both Lord and head,
> the myrth and might of the majesty.
> (I, 165-172)

When the magnifico, Duke Frederick, in As You Like It commands obedience from an inferior, Shakespeare gives him the wilful, menacing tone we have already noticed in Preston's King Cambyses and many Herods:

> . . . but looke to it,
> Finde out thy brother wheresoere he is,
> Seeke him with Candle: bring him dead, or living
> Within this twelvemonth, or turne thou no more
> To seeke a living in our Territorie.
> Thy Lands and all things that thou dost call thine,
> Worth seizure, do we seize into our hands. . . .
> (III, i; 1184-1190)

The minions of the "quasi-kings" in Tudor plays express their recognition of a higher power in a manner similar to the courtesies paid ordinary kings. Sometimes, the personae addressed their superiors by their titles, or alluded in some way to their sovereignty. In Mary Magdalene, the women at the sepulchre in Jerusalem lament Christ's death as a lost king:

> Maudlyn. Alas! Alas! for þat ryall bem!
>
> M. Jacobe. and þey dysspyttyd þer kyng ryall.
> (II, xxiii, 933, 999)

Two scenes further on, Mary Magdalen greets the risen Christ this way:

> O, þow dere worthy emperowere! þou hye devyne!
> to me þis is a Joyfull tydyng,
> And on-to all pepull þat after us xall reyngne. . . .
> (II, xxv, 1086-1088)

A gentleman in Heywood's The Play of the Weather addresses Jupiter in language appropriate for a king's subject:

> Moste myghty prynce and god of every nacyon
> Pleasyth your hyghnes to vouchsave the herynge
> Of me. . . .
> (sig. B1$^{r}$)

The merchant who appeals to Jupiter next says:

> Most myghty prynce and lorde of lordes all
> Ryght humbly besecheth your majeste
> Your marchaunt men. . . .
> (sig. B2$^{v}$)

In As You Like It, Shakespeare makes Oliver reply to Duke Frederick in this wise: "Oh that your Highnesse knew my heart in this. . ." (III, i, 1193). Lysander, in A Midsummer Night's Dream, recognizes his ruler's dignity when he returns Duke Theseus's greeting wishing him much love and joy. "More then to us," he answers, "waite in your royall walkes, your boord, your bed" (V, i, 1824-1825). Satan's immediate grudge against Jesus in The Chester Plays' Temptation pageant is that he does not recognize a superior power: "My highnes aye he putis behynde" (XII, 41).

In Mundus and Infans, Manhood addresses Mundus with the effusive humility due a prince:

Grammercy worlde and emperour
Grammercy worlde and governoure
Grammercy conforte in all coloure.

(sig. A4$^{v}$)

The angelic retinue of The Chester Plays' Deus Pater acknowledges his majesty. God is the "prince withoutten peere" (I, 62), whom they thank "full soverayntlie" (57) with "somp solace" and song. Adam addresses Deus Pater as "Highe god and highest kinge" (II, 425); Noah calls him "Lord, God in Majesty" (III, 305-312), while Abraham uses the titles, "lord of heaven and King of blise" (IV, 437).

The royal nature of the divine Christ Child in The Chester Plays is acknowledged by many minor characters who address him as king. One of the Magi describes himself as Christ's "Subject and his thrall" (IX, 37-40). Before his usurpation, the Chester Lucifer expresses obeisance and loyalty to Deus Pater:

Nay, Lorde, that will not wee in dede,
for nothing trespas unto thee;
for thy great godhead ay will we dreade
and never exalte ourselves so hye.

(I, 73-76)

After performing his "miracles" to prove the divine quality of his majesty, The Chester Plays' Antichrist persuades a clutch of petty kings to become his retinue. Convinced of his "posty" now, the kings invite him to ascend the Cathedral throne, offering to bow at his feet:

O! Gracious lord, goe, sitt downe then!
And we shall, knelinge on our knen,
Worship thee as thyne owne men,
And work after thy love.

(XIII, 177-180)

The shepherds and the Magi approach the manger on their knees, and utter ceremonial speeches acknowledging sovereign power:

> Haile, King of heaven so hy,
> . . . . . . . . . . .
> Haile, King borne in a maydens bowre!
> . . . . . . . . . . .
> Haile the, Emperour of hell,
> and of heaven als!
> . . . . . . . . . . .
> Haile, prynce withoutten peere. . . .
>
> (VII, 563-587)

Heywood's Jupiter, in The Play of the Weather, expects to bring his subjects to their knees, "Sooly to honour oure hyeness day be day" (sig. A2 r).

Quasi-kings, like ordinary royalty, could be dramatized in situations intrinsically expressive of the nature of their power over others. When one character of extraordinary majesty meets another, the Tudor dramatist is apt to handle them with techniques similar to those used for dramatizing encounters of royalty of ordinary stature. Lucifer seizes Deus Pater's throne in The Chester Plays, in an episode containing echoes of the Tudor king plays in which two figures presuming to royal office refuse to recognize each other's claims. Lucifer is the challenger of Deus Pater's sovereignty as Lluellen challenges Longshanks in George Peele's King Edward the First. He is also the deputy who has exceeded his grant of power, much as Sisamnes overreached himself in Preston's Cambyses King of Persia. Deus Pater reacts with predictable indignation:

> Say, what Aray doe yow make here?
> Who is your prince and principall?
>
> (I, 193-194)

God is as outraged as King Henry is when he finds the Duke of York in his place in Shakespeare's 3 Henry VI (i, i): ". . . who set thee here, when I was goe?" (I, 201). He assumes the injured tone of Henry V when he discovers the treachery of Cambridge, Scroope and Grey (Henry V, II, ii):

> I made thee my frende, thou arte my foe!
> whie hast thou trespassed thus to me?
> Above all Angels there were no mo
> that sate so nighe the majestye.
>
> (I, 203-206)

He orders Lucifer down: "I charge you fall. . ." (I, 207). And, in this instance, the usurper does, indeed, come down.

The other category of situations distinctive of affairs of royalty, gift-giving and bestowal of largess, occurs also in the dramatization of characters of extraordinary majesty. The gift, presented by a subject or vassal, is a dramatic recognition of majesty. The splendid treasures the Magi brought to the Christ Child in cyclical dramas are presented in the ceremonial style of the royal gift-giving that was a feature of English pageantry celebrating an "entry" of a king.

Antichrist, in The Chester Plays, adopts the royal custom of distributing largess. He doles out lands generously:

> To thee I geeve Lumbardy,
> and to the Denmark and Hungary,
> and take thou Pathmos and Italy,
> and Roome it shall by thyne,
>
> (XXIII, 241-244)

and promises to bestow power:

> You Kinges, I shall advaunce you all,
> and because your Regions be but small,
> Cityes, Castles shall you befall,
> with Townes and Towrs gay. . . .
>
> (XXIII, 213-216)

The most notable affectation of princeliness which Satan displays in The Chester Plays' Temptation pageant is his offer to bestow power and dominions on Jesus (XII, 133-136). As a final gesture of royal largess, Jesus in majesty intercedes with his Father for the Apostles. He dispatches seven gifts to God's "menye" by the Holy Ghost, a token promising that they, too, will wear the crown in heaven, will "ever. . . raygne in possession" (XXI, 173), after a second and final coming of Christ to earth.

Even the royal banquet could be part of the expression of sovereignty for "quasi-kings" in Tudor drama. His will drawn, the magnifico Cyrus in Mary Magdalene orders his retinue of knights to bring in a banquet of wine and spices to celebrate the occasion (I, ii, 112). It would not be amiss to regard the Last Suppers of the cycle plays as versions of the royal banquet served by a divine host who washes the feet of his guests, and, by this inversion of customary roles, does them homage on his knees.[6]

Duke Theseus, the splendid magnifico of Shakespeare's A Midsummer Night's Dream, when demanding entertainment for his court, assumes the royal manner of calling for a banquet and seeking counsel, both at once:

> Come now, what maskes, what dances shall we have,
> To weare away this long age of three houres,
> Between our after supper, and bed-time?
> Where is our usual manager of mirth?
> What Revels are in hand? Is there no play,
> To ease the anguish of a torturing houre?
> Call Egeus.
> (V, i; 1826-1833)

A version of the councillor, a Master of Revels, steps from the Duke's retinue with a bill of theatrical fare to tempt the princely taste:

> There is a breefe how many sports are rife:
> Make choice of which your Highnesse will see first.
> (V, i; 1839-1840)

Theseus orders the mechanicals' play. Here is his expression of royal largess toward the hard-handed performers:

> The kinder we, to give them thanks for nothing
> Our sport shall be, to take what they mistake;
> And what poore duty cannot doe, noble respect
> Takes it in might,not merit.
>
> (V, i; 1886-1889)

This concludes our survey of the principle attributes of ordinary figures of royalty which Tudor dramatists gave also to special characters representing extraordinary sovereign powers. The majestic treatment of such personae forms a considerable background for the characterization of royalty in Tudor drama, in which princely figures derived some of their "character" from the way in which the dramatists contrasted them with "quasi-kings," or made the two sorts of princely characters imitate and sometimes even merge with each other. We shall see more of these "quasi-kings" in relation to ordinary royalty in the next chapter, which discusses their function in defining the moral nature of the ordinary figures of royalty in Tudor drama.

# Chapter III

Structural characteristics of Sixteenth Century English drama have long interested critics, among them M. M. Reese, who compared the morality plays with later history plays,[1] and David Bevington, whose study of the same subject led him more recently to examine the plays for their political connotations.[2] To understand the structural principles of Sixteenth Century English drama in terms of artistic technique we can do no better than turn to a Canadian critic of Shakespearean drama. In his study of Elizabethan and Jacobean comedy and tragedy, John Orrell finds that the playwrights, no less than painters and musicians, used repetition of forms as an artistic principle. He tells us further that formal parallelism was commonly a means by which the dramatists could inspire a moral response to their plays:

> Sometimes. . . repeated action encourages a particular moral attitude, either toward a character or toward the whole action of a play. But it is also particularly suited to the vivid depiction of change in characters and situation.[3]

It is true that Professor Orrell is here considering the change in character and the creation of a moral attitude in the audience as separate functions of repetitive design in dramaturgy. But, as he demonstrates later, the two functions are frequently bound up together, especially in tragedy, when extended repetitions provide the contrasts that urge a further judgment of a character.[4]

It is also true that Professor Orrell considers the scene as the basis of action, and hence the primary unit of formal design in drama. Yet he widens his view considerably in the course of his argument, so that not only scenes and details of action may be thought of as part of the formal pattern, but also language itself, as a kind of action that may be repeated.[5] These forms of repetition may all bear upon the moral definition of a royal character in a play.

It is from Professor Orrell's work, which brings so much of the playwrights' craftsmanship to our notice, that I have derived many of the ideas about the drama that will be useful henceforth in illuminating the figures of royalty on the Tudor stage. One of the most important of these borrowed ideas helps explain how many dramatists established the elementary moral type of their royal personae. I mean the function of the formal parallelism in depicting the moral order as a simple division between the good and the bad through the arrangement of a drama's characters in groups of opposites, a point Professor Orrell necessarily mentions only in passing.[6]

The moral organization of the characters appearing in a play or cycle, therefore, generally insists upon a fundamental definition of a king figure's moral nature, his goodness or his badness. We shall look at some extended examples of formal parallelism in Tudor drama, and learn how the playwrights could use that principle to portray the moral "character" of royalty in their plays. After we have seen how the moral dichotomy of characters arranged in formal patterns could establish the king figure's moral type or kind, in a simple sense, we can examine techniques by which the playwrights could vary the details of their moral portrait of royalty.

First, since we are already somewhat familiar with The Chester Plays, we can easily sketch the main lines of their parallel groups of characters as a typical instance of the moral structure of Tudor cyclical drama. On the one hand are the sacred characters, whose definitions as versions of majesty were the subject of Chapter II. God and Jesus, alternatively known as Deus Pater and the Christ Child, are essentially the same, wherever they appear in the cycle, and whatever appropriate names the dramatists chose to give them in the cycle's many episodes. The peculiar "continuousness" of the divine characters in a long cycle is a dramatization of the fact that they are, as they often explain, without beginning (I, 5; II, 2), or end (II, 3), and are one and the same entity (XI, 237-240).

Opposing these sacred characters are the demonic figures, Lucifer, Satan, and Antichrist. In The Chester Plays, the demonic figures also bear characteristics of royalty, as they do to a lesser extent in Ludus Coventriae, which we shall be examining later. The demons, too, may be regarded as refigurings of essentially the same character having many roles in a long episodic drama, again a dramatization of their own endless influence, which one of them may occasionally mention (XXIII, 8 and 39-40). Other cyclical dramas used during the Tudor period have, in general, much the same scheme of sacred and demonic characters, although the marks of royalty are differently handled in each, and the naive moral order may show anomalies here and there.

The parallel arrangement of the principal personae in a cyclical drama may be further described as a kind of "history," unfolding as the dramatic action proceeds. From this perspective, too, a repetitive pattern emerges with a moral dichotomy of characters. In the first pageant of The Chester Plays, Deus Pater appears in majesty aloft, proclaims his sovereignty, and creates the heavens and the orders of angels. Lucifer, a rebel among the steadfast, seizes the heavenly throne, and is flung into hell for his disobedience and pride. That first episode, and the simple moral characterizations it establishes -- the good, and their wicked adversaries -- set the pattern for all that follows. Each situation in the drama may be prophetic of a future episode, as the Chester Expositor sometimes explains. Or it may be a repetition, with variations, of an earlier episode. Thus, any episode in a cycle may seem a miniature of the action of the entire drama.

From the "historical" point of view, each character may likewise be an antetype or prior likeness of others, an example either of Vice or Virtue. The good, like Isaac, are antetypes or prefigurations of Christ; the evil, for example, Antichrist, are types of Satan, and are enemies of the Godhead. In such order does the world in The Chester Plays advance from Creation to Doomsday, with repeated struggles between good and wicked types for the adherence of mankind. And in such order does the world proceed in the other English cycles as well.

On the face of it, the moral parallelism of the Tudor cycles seems simple. Yet dramatic artists found a way to complicate the basic moral dichotomy of good characters and bad characters. Before going on, we must examine this important complication in the basic scheme, because it can affect divine and demonic characters who are given the features of royalty, and the ordinary king figures as well.

The similar royal treatments of Jesus and Antichrist in The Chester Plays mentioned in Chapter II make it plain that Tudor dramatists could employ the techniques of defining royalty to make one kind of character seem a version of a wholly different kind. A demonic figure is made similar to a divine king, not only by his actions and speeches, but by the way his appearance is incorporated into the structure of the cycle as a "history." Antichrist's entry as a quasi-king is heralded by prophets, a version of an earlier episode which prepared for the Nativity of the Christ Child as a personage of divine and royal lineage. Antichrist even pretends to be Christ (XXIII, 16). Furthermore, Antichrist's assertions of sovereign power over kings and princes echo the imperial style that Deus Pater uses in the first pageant. Lucifer and Satan, too, sound a little like Deus Pater because they also use the device he uses, the declaration of majesty.

Obviously, more is involved in the likeness of such divine and demonic characters than the simple paralleling of one figure by another through their assumptions of regal characteristics and royal style. The attributes of royalty given to numbers of interrelated characters in The Chester Plays make it possible to understand whole groups of figures as transformations of other groups. This is a form of repetitive structure that allowed one set of characters to imitate another set.

Sometimes, we can tell that one kind of character is supposed to be an imitation of another when we find something consistently meaner or coarser about the way he is handled, despite his similarities to his original. For example, the first mention of Antichrist in The Chester Plays is in the pageant that immediately precedes his own performance. But Jesus' arrival as a heavenly prince is heralded, as we know, as early as the Abraham pageant (IV, 137-144), and devices looking forward to his coming steadily intensify the excitement of anticipation from that point on. In many other ways, too, the treatment of Jesus is much weightier than Antichrist's, even in minor details, so that more prophets predict the coming of the real Messiah (V) than do so for his imitator (XII).

The imitative element in the moral dichotomy of drama introduces the problem of the pretender and his original. A character may be good, or he may be an imitator of the good, and therefore bad. This complication of the elementary moral parallelism may also add another dimension to the moral type of the ordinary king figure in the drama, as he comes under the influence of one set or another of characters arranged as transformations of each other: those representing moral goodness, and those representing the evil imitations of goodness.

Now, having sorted out some of the fundamentals of moral characterization through parallel categories of good and evil personae in The Chester Plays as a typical cyclical drama, we may proceed to the next step. As should be plain by now, the cyclical dramatists ordinarily had two choices in depicting each of their princely characters as a moral being according to his place in the two-fold scheme just described. He was an adherent of either divine or demonic figures. In a great cycle like The Chester Plays, the chain of characters linked together through their moral type can be extensive, and what happens to one character in the chain may affect the rest of his moral "kin." Besides the divine and demonic characters whom the dramatists defined as versions of royalty giving moral shape to the whole cycle, The Chester Plays has eighteen king figures who may be considered the ordinary kind of stage royalty. We shall examine the treatment of all of them, as examples of the moral characterization of kings in a Tudor cyclical drama, and determine their moral allegiances.

Six of our princely characters may be described all together as ordinary figures of royalty of the simplest sort, whose moral character is sufficiently indicated by their names, and is further explained in their speeches. These are the pairs of emperors, kings, and queens among the saved and the damned souls, in the dramatized version of the Dance of Death that constitutes The Chester Plays' pageant of The Last Judgment (XXIV). The good declare themselves as such by their reverence for Christ. They join the Godhead. Rex Salvatus says:

> A! lord of lordes, and kinge of kinges,
> and Informer of all thinges,
> thy power, lord, spreads and Springes,
> as soothly here is seen.
> . . . . . . . . . . . .
> . . . I am purged to thy pay,
> with thee evermore to dwell.
>
> (XXIV, 109-140)

The wicked, like Regina Damnatus, belong to the devils. She accounts for herself, thus:

> Alas! Alas! now am I lorne!
> . . . . . . . . . . . .
> I made my mone, both even and morne,
> for fear to come Jesu beforne,
> . . . . . . . . . . . .
> wher in world is any wight,

that for my fayrnes now will feight?
or from this deathe I am to dight,
that dare me heathen draw?

(XXIV, 261-292)

The Chester dramatists portrayed the moral condition of the rest of their kingly characters in more complicated ways. The first is King Melchisadech. He appears in an obscure incident of Chester's Sacrifice of Isaac (IV), to which an Expositor gives an allegorical meaning that anticipates the coming of New Testament law, actually an accomplishment of Jesus. We can quickly estimate Melchisadech's moral type as good, because Abraham, himself defined as a type of God by the Expositor, recognizes Melchisadech's royal dignity. In a prayer of thanksgiving for his own victories over other kings, Abraham recommends Melchisadech to God as:

Melchisadech, that here kinge is
And Gods preist also, I wis. . . .
the tyth I will geve him of this,
as skill is that I doe.

(IV, 33-36)

To welcome Abraham, King Melchisadech produces wine and bread, a spiritualized version of the royal banquet. Abraham brings Melchisadech a royal present of a horse laden with war booty, the gift he has described as a tithe to God. In this little scene, the dramatists have mingled almost inseparably the religious and secular elements of the marks of royalty, so that Melchisadech, who speaks of his own kingly rank simply as his "dignitie" (IV, 94), emerges dimly as a devout, and therefore good king.

King Balaack, in the pageant of Moses and the Ten Commandments, is easily typed, too. Ascending a scenic mount that Moses has just left, Balaack proclaims his own sovereignty as "King of Moab land" (V, 89), and voices his wrath against the people Moses leads. He commands a servant to fetch Balaam to curse the followers of Moses, promising wealth and advancement if only Balaam will abandon his commitment to God:

> Thou shalt have riches, golde, and fee,
> and I shall advance thy dignytye,
> to curse men, cursed they may be,
> that thou shalt see to day.
>
> (V, 213-216)

When he fails to persuade Balaam to do his bidding, Balaack curses him in the name of "Mahound" (V, 288). Clearly, King Balaack's moral "character" is bad, if only by way of his pagan connections and his declared hostility against God's will and God's people.

Octavian's Nuntius, boisterously making "rowme" for him, does not even refer to that emperor's title when preparing his entry (VI, 177-178), a misleading circumstance that puts Octavian's moral condition in doubt for the moment. His braggartly self-announcement that he is a "preeved prynce," with power to destroy kings, princes, and nobility "through vertue of my degree" (VI, 185-192), bodes ill for the coming Christ Child. But when his Senators beg him to become a god (VI, 305-312), Octavian firmly rejects the offer (V, 337-340). And, when the Sibyl notifies him of the birth of a superior sovereign (VI, 657-664), Octavian, in a royal acknowledgement of divine royalty, orders incense burned to honour the "King of Mercy" (VI, 673-674). Moreover, he orders his Senators to make the people worship Christ. Despite our first uncertainty about Octavian, his prompt recognition of Christ's divine majesty marks him unmistakeably as good. He belongs with the Three

Magi, exemplars of royal goodness, whose treatment as subjects of a superior sovereign was mentioned in Chapter II.

The Chester Plays' first King Herod rejects the Magi's tidings of a "Roy de Caelli et Terrae" (VIII, 152), by insisting that he himself is a "soveraigne Syre" and Tyrant. In his blustering, Herod has some characteristics of Emperor Octavian. He warns his visitors that he, Herod, is the only ruler. He calls upon a doctor of divinity in his retinue to look up prophecies in Scripture. The upshot of the Doctor's researches is that all the prophets' sayings upset Herod's claims to the throne, in favour of Jesus' line:

> And now fullfilled is Jacobs prophesie,
> for kinge Herode that is now raigning,
> is no Jew borne ne of that Progenie
> but a stranger, by the Romans made their kinge;
> and the Jewes knowe none of their bloud descending
> by succession to clayme the Scepter and regallitie,
> wherfore Christ now is borne, our King and Messy.
> (VIII, 268-274)

Herod will have none of such revelations which make him out to be no more than a pretender. Outraged, he invokes his "right title to expel" (VIII, 349). He threatens to murder the Magi, "all three traytors" (VIII, 391). Then, he orders the Slaying of Innocents (X), one of the spectacular episodes of the drama. Although he has bragged that he drives devils into hell, which seems a good thing to do, his moral type cannot be anything but utterly wicked. His sham of rightful sovereignty and goodness makes him an appropriate associate of the demonic figures of The Chester Plays who characteristically imitate divine majesty.

The second Herod of The Chester Plays begins the mockery of Jesus as a royal figure in the travesty of king's livery. This Herod orders Jesus to be dressed in a white robe, the mark of a madman (XVI, 201-204), to which the Jews add the crown of thorns and other perversions of the king's attributes. Herod's responsibility for such sacrilegious activities makes him, too, irretrievably bad.

There remain of The Chester Plays' kings still four more in The Coming of Antichrist (XXIII). Their moral status changes twice, as they shift their allegiance from Jesus to his imitator and back again to Jesus. When at first their skepticism makes them reluctant to acknowledge Antichrist as a divine king, these four kings align themselves with the good characters of the drama. Later, they are overwhelmed by Antichrist's miracles, and submit to him. Their apparent stupidity has made them bad. Yet, once they are persuaded that the prophets Enoch and Ely have "taynted thy Tyrant," and that the real Christ is immanent, they change their minds again. They believe in the real Christ now (XXIII, 593-620). The pretender finally kills them for rebels:

> A! false fayturs, turne ye now?
> Ye shall be slayne, I make a vow
> and thos Traytors that torned you,
> I shall make them unfayne. . . .
> . . . . . . . . . . . .
> for all you shall be slayne.
>
> (XXIII, 621-628)

Nevertheless, at the last moment, the four kings seem to belong once more to the company of the good.

For further insights into the versatility with which different dramatists could handle figures of ordinary royalty as simple moral types based on a cyclical drama's dichotomy of characters, we can glance briefly at Ludus Coventriae. The manuscript of this cycle is about a century older than the existing manuscripts of The Chester Plays, so that it is dated in the 1490s, the early years of the Tudor dynasty.[7] Ludus Coventriae has twenty-one characters who are more or less ordinary kings, but, except for the key king figures -- Herod and the Magi -- whom it shares with most other cycles, they are organized in a wholly different manner from those in The Chester Plays.

Five of Ludus Coventriae's kings are much the same moral types as their counterparts in The Chester Plays, and for much the same reasons, although details are treated differently. The Three Magi are conspicuously good, for their devotion to the Christ Child. The two Herods are thoroughly bad because of their efforts to destroy Jesus. The wickedness of Ludus Coventriae's first Herod is emphasized in the dramatization of his doom. God's messenger, Mors, slays him and his retinue of knights while they are making merry at a royal banquet in celebration of the Massacre of Innocents (20: 232-233). King Herod is borne away by a Diabolus to join the company he belongs to.

The moral condition of The Three Princes who appear in Ludus Coventriae's Assumption of the Virgin (41) has a function similar to that of the Four Kings in The Chester Plays' Antichrist pageant (XXIII). Both groups are notable for their moral vacillations during the last moments before a final judgment. Ludus Coventriae's Three Princes begin badly. The swearing and violent soldier who announces their entry as "owre worthy prynsis" (41:3) invites the judgment that they are wicked. A bishop suspects that they may not be wicked enough.

He wonders if there might not be a "renogat" among them (41: 16). When Primus Princeps reveals that the little company is among those responsible for the death of Jesus, their badness is more convincing:

> Sere syn we slew hym • that clepid hym oure kyng
> and seyde he was goddis sone • lord over all
> Syn his deth I herd of no maner rysyng
> and lo yif he hadde leyvd • he had mad us his thrall.
> (41: 26-30)

These Princes have come together as a kind of emergency council to advise the bishop on civil order. They give conflicting advice about how to remedy the disturbances raised by preachers of Christ's law. They variously recommend that the culprits be imprisoned, be slain with swords, or hanged. Their royal judgments on those who teach Jesus' doctrines marks them as violently evil. The bishop should be satisfied. But, for practical reasons, the bishop rejects all the princely advice as certain to cause more trouble. Later, maddened by the commotion accompanying the Virgin Mary's funeral, the bishop orders the Princes into the street to seize the body (41: 368). As he curses the Princes for being dumbstruck fools (41: 360-362), we feel sure that their badness is coupled with mere pretensions to princely power. They seem showpieces of royalty whom the bishop really rules.

The pretensions of the Princes take another turn, however. As the bishop has surmised, they are not, without exception, loyal to the forces of evil. In the street, Secundus Princeps suddenly loses his "posty," which stimulates fear in Tertius Princeps. Accusing his fellows of cowardice, Primus Princeps boldly lays hands on the Virgin's coffin, only to be seized by a miraculous paralysis that holds him fast and immobile. The miracle causes his change of heart. He believes in Jesus' power now. Moments before demons appear to seize the wicked, Primus Princeps persuades Secundus Princeps also to forsake his "maumentryes" (41: 441). With two of the potentially three enemies of the Christians converted, the Assumption of the Virgin Mary into heaven proceeds without hindrance. Thus, two of the Princes achieve moral goodness, while the third, although suggestible, remains firmly, but ineffectually bad.

We must still assess Ludus Coventriae's remaining thirteen kings. Fortunately, all of them, tribal monarchs from the Old Testament, are mustered for a single processional episode, The Prophets (7). There, from David Rex to Manassas Rex, they alternate with patriarchs to foretell the coming of the king of heaven, and testify to the sacerdotal lineage of Jesus and his mother. They cannot be judged as otherwise than both good and authentic, because, in declaring themselves to be kings, they assert the royal genealogy of Jesus.

These examples of the dramatization of stage kings as moral types early in the Tudor period and near its end should adequately illustrate the usefulness of parallel arrangements of characters as the basis of formal moral order in Tudor cyclical drama. It should also be clear that the shifting of a princely figure from one moral category to its opposite could invite a new judgment of his moral condition. In addition, we saw that the two moral categories of good and bad characters, when treated as transformations of each other, could mean that a king figure, as well as other characters, could seem to imitate goodness, and perhaps even badness. We shall leave until later a discussion of what these last points meant for dramatists as means of defining the subtleties of royalty's moral character. For the present, we must examine the moral dichotomy of stage types in other kinds of king plays besides the great cycles. These other royal dramas followed traditions established in the cycles.

In a speech already mentioned, one of the Chester Herods provides a touchstone of moral order as it was dramatized in many Tudor king plays:

> I king of kinges, none so keene,
> I soveraigne Syre, as well as seene,
> I Tyrant, that may both take and teene
> Castle, tower, and towne,
>
> I weilde this world withouten wene,
> I beat all those unbuxon beene
> I dryve the Devills all by deene
> deepe in hell a-downe.
>
> (VIII, 161-168)

The word to notice among all these vauntings of power and force is "Tyrant." Even in plays which had no divine and demonic characters as parallel groups of personae organizing the moral background of the drama, figures of royalty could be dramatized as either bad or good according to the contrasts revealed by the conventional behaviour of their own moral types. By themselves, the figures of royalty could constitute parallel categories of morality under whom other personae could be organized. On the one side of the formal pattern of royal morality, as the Tudor dramatists conceived it, was the Tyrant. On the other side was the Christian Prince.

The parallel moral types of kings, Tyrant and Christian Prince, were long known as a version of the two kinds of ruler described in Aristotle's Politics,[8] and numerous other works containing advice to princes. But, during the Sixteenth Century, they gained much wider currency through Erasmus's Education of a Christian Prince. As Erasmus described the Christian Prince, his moral "character" properly included the virtues of reverence, courtesy, and compassion. The good prince was a living likeness of God, whose goodness made him want to help all, while he himself eschewed baseness. But a Tyrant was the craftiest of deceivers, a sacrilegious pagan, and a ferocious and cruel pillager.[9]

Archetypes of the Christian Prince and Tyrant exist in the cyclical dramas we have been examining. The Magi and the Herods, with their conventional behaviour and their characteristic attitudes toward divine majesty, were the reliable measure of goodness and badness in royalty for many Tudor Englishmen who had not read Erasmus. The moral "characters" of the Magi and the Herods, as types of the Christian Prince and Tyrant, were largely composed of contrasting ways of handling the marks of royalty which identified them as king figures in the first place.

The reverence and courtesy of the Magi were the main traits of their moral "character" which make them seem like Christian Princes. With each other, the Magi observe courtesies. This is III Rex greeting the other two kings in the Coventry Shearmen and Taylors' pageant:

> Hayle, cumly kyngis augent!
> Good surs, I pray you, whedder ar ye ment?
> . . . . . . . . . . .
> Surs, I pray you, and thatt ryght umblee,
> With you thatt I ma ryde in cumpane.
> (594-600)

Although not as effusively, the Magi in The Chester Plays are even polite to Herod:

Primus Rex

Beleave, Sir, and have good day
till we come againe this way.

Secundus Rex

Sir, as sone as ever we may,
and as we seene, so shall we say.

(VIII, 366-369)

As they come into the Christ Child's presence in The Chester Plays, the Magi demonstrate their princely respectfulness to divine majesty. To characterize them as devout, the dramatists have transformed the flexible device of Anaphora, repeated words or phrases to begin verses, into a stately ritual of equally long speeches of oblation. Even though we have heard the "Hail" to royalty before in quite different contexts, we know that here it indicates a reverential approach, because its use resembles a litany:

Primus Rex

Haile be thou, Lord Christ and Messye
that from God art come kindlye
. . . . . . . . . . .

Secundus Rex

Haile be thou, Christ Emanuell,
thou comen are for mans heale
. . . . . . . . . . .

Tertius Rex

Haile Conquerour of all mankinde!
to do mercy thou hast mynde
. . . . . . . . . . .

(IX, 137-184)

In the cyclical drama, the quality of mercy as a virtue befitting the Christian Prince was portrayed in the sacred persona of Jesus, the original for all good princes to copy. *Ludus Coventriae's* Contemplacio appeals to divine mercy almost as if it alone were the essence of high majesty:

> good lord have on man pyte
> . . . . . . . . . . . .
> lete mercy meke þin hyest mageste.
> . . . . . . . . . . . .
> Cum vesyte us in þis tyme of nede
> of þi careful creaturys have compassyon.
> (11: 6-16)

The episode which Contemplacio's moving prayer opens, The Parliament of Heaven, is a dramatization of Ffilius's compassionate decision to intervene in behalf of mankind, because "ȝiff a-nother deth come not • mercy xulde perysch" (11: 142).

In contrast, cruelty and violence are Herod's moral trademarks which make him the picture of the Tyrant as the bad king. In the Coventry Shearmen and Taylors' pageant he is a crude bully:

> And with this bryght bronde there bonis I brak onsunder,
> Thatt all the wyde worlde on these rappis did wonder.
> (491-492)

This is *Ludus Coventriae's* Herod ordering the Massacre of Innocents:

> I xal prune þat paphawk and prevyn him as a pad
> . . . . . . . . . . . .
> my knyghtys xaln rydyn on rowe
> knave chylderyn ffor to qwelle
> be mahound dyngne duke of helle.
> (18: 88-92)

*Ludus Coventriae's* other Herod orders a beating for Jesus:

> what spek I say • þou foulyng • evyl mote þow fare
> loke up • þe devyl mote þe cheke
> Serys bete his body with scorgys bare
> and A-say to make hym for to speke.
> (30: 433-436)

The Tyrant's impious nature is revealed in Herod's faith in

Mohamet, and worse, his personal pretensions to divinity. It would be impossible for anyone, he declares in the Coventry Shearmen and Taylors' pageant, "To reycownt unto you my inneumerabull substance" (500).

> For I am evyn he thatt made bothe hevin and hell,
> And of my myghte powar holdith up this world rownd.
> . . . . . . . . . . . .
> I am the cawse of this grett lyght and thunder;
> . . . . . . . . . . . .
> All the whole world from the north to the sowthe
> I ma them dystroie with won worde of my mowthe!
> (488-499)

In his rage, this same Herod, heedless of the common weal, orders a five-mark tax on foreign ships and passing strangers (522-524). He orders a search for aliens (533-536). And he craftily pretends to the Magi that he is their friend, inviting them to a banquet (659-663), and granting them extended passports and privileges (670), all the while plotting to destroy them.

Even Herod's royal trappings symbolize the Tyrant's cruelty. The Coventry Smith's Company made his crown with a crest of iron, and dressed it with colours, and gold and silver foil.[10] Besides his scepter, he carries a gilded "fawchon" or club, and sometimes also a spear or sword, with which to threaten other characters in the play.[11] In Coventry, where the Smiths' Company records show he had a painted face, mask, or "head," Herod leaped off his stage to intimidate the audience in the street.[12] In a demonstration of ruthless force at the end of the Coventry Shearmen and Taylors' pageant, he pursues the fleeing Holy Family on the horse that brought him into the playing place with a show of royal power (894-895).

Given the opposite moral types of royalty that the Magi and

Herod represented as exemplars of the Christian Prince and the Tyrant, it was not necessary to have the guiding presence of God and Satan on stage to indicate whether a princely character was good or not. In the drama, the Christian Prince and the Tyrant each had a style and decorum that identified him as a distinct moral type. Because of the Magi and Herod, who appeared year after year in performances of cyclical drama during religious festivals, the characteristics of the Christian Prince and the Tyrant were familiar to most of the Tudor audience. Usually everyone knew approximately where the dramatist was drawing the conventional moral lines when he presented an ordinary king figure on the stage. In fact, if we refer to some of the speeches of royalty used as illustrations in Chapter I, we can often decide whether we are hearing the moral type of Christian Prince, or a Tyrant. A Christian Prince seems something like one of the Magi, and perhaps even like Christ. But a Tyrant generally comes through as a version of Herod.

Therefore, when we hear King Darius, we presume he is good, and not only because the Proloquotor has told us so already:

> Then my servauntes come stand before me,
> And hearken to that which I shall say to ye.
> Let all thinges be prepared quickly,
> Let all this be done without remedy.
> See there lack nothing when they be heare,
> And let them not spare to eate of this our cheare.
> (King Darius, sig. D2 $^{r}$)

Nor is it surprising when Darius says later:

> Welcome syrs of truth you are,
> To this our poore and symple fare,

> But thank God and prayse his name,
> Which to us hath sent this same.
>
> (sig. D3$^{r}$)

Darius's gentleness and his reverence mark him as the moral type of the Christian Prince. He seems quite capable of rewarding the truthful and reproaching dissemblers, as, indeed, it turns out.

In Cambyses King of Persia, Thomas Preston could make a Tyrant just as unmistakeable:

> I know thou hast a blissful babe, wherin thou doost delight:
> Me to revenge of these thy words, I will go wreke this spight
> When I the most have tasted wine, my bow it shalbe bent:
> At hart of him even then to shoote, is now my whole intent.
> And if that I his hart can hit, the king no drunkard is:
> . . . . . . . . . . . .
> There is no way I tell thee plaine, but I will do this deed.
>
> (sig. C4$^{r}$)

Cambises' cruelty and wilfulness, and his vulgar immoderation, mark him as morally bad.

The moral opposites of the Christian Prince and the Tyrant were the bases of the symmetrical design of many king plays of the Tudor period in which balanced groups of characters, marked by the decorum of their princely leader, functioned as moral transformation of each other. John Bale used that design in King Johan.

As a moral type of royalty, Kyng Johan, who represents an historic English king, is intended to be a Christian Prince. He is reverent toward divine authority, citing God's ordinance (A: 174), the Scriptures, and Christ's example as grounds for his royal power and princely estate:

> To declare the powre, & their force to enlarge
> the scriptur of god, doth flow In most abowndaunce
> & of sophystere, the cauteles to dyscharge

> bothe peter & pawle, makyth plenteosse utterauns
> how that all pepell, shuld shew ther trew alegyauns
> to ther lawfull kyng, christ Jesu dothe consent
> whych to þe hygh powre, was ever obedyent. . . .
> (A: 1-7)

Sometimes he quotes the Bible to clinch an argument (A: 54-55). He addresses God directly in prayer:

> and now to the lorde, I would resygne up gladlye
> [. . .] Both my crowne and lyfe, for thyne owne ryght it is
> If it would please the, to take my sowle to thy blys.
> (B: 2013-2015)

Although he is not a spendthrift with compliments, Kyng Johan displays a certain gentility: "than gentyll wydowe, tell me wat þe mater ys (A: 26). He abhors foul language (A: 45).

But Kyng Johan's greatest virtue as a figure of the Christian Prince is his compassion. He takes up the cause of the poor widow Ynglond whom the Roman clergy has despoiled of her wealth. Indeed, his profound humanitarianism finally causes Kyng Johan to submit to the Tyrant he opposes:

> More of compassyon, for shedynge of Christen blood
> Than any thynge else, my sceptre I gave up latelye
> To the pope of Rome, whych hath no tytle good
> Of jurisdycton, but of usurpacyon only.
> (B: 2009-2012)

Kyng Johan is opposed in his enterprise of reform by Usurpid Power, the alias Bale gives for part of the drama to Pope Innocent III, the ecclesiastical prince who imposes his authority on the English king. Even in the farcical episodes, before Usurpid Power and his retinue of vices change their identities and costumes to represent the historical figures that bring about John's defeat, Bale treats Usurpid Power as the moral type of Tyrant. Sedition reports that Usurpid Power is

"More ferce than a turcke" (A: 767). Usurpid Power and his crew mock sacramental customs. They lay cruel plans to bring Kyng Johan to his knees, even at the cost of thousands slain and others burnt (B: 975-979). Their crudity and lewdness are the opposite of the unadorned gentility that Bale gives his Kyng Johan, protector of Ynglond, and obviously good.

The conventional traits of the Christian Prince and the Tyrant allowed George Gascoigne and Francis Kinwelmersh to use stage effects to express visually, in parallel groups of characters, the moral opposition of goodness and badness. In Jocasta, the Queen brings together for a parley the two princes contending for the possession of Thebes. Gascoigne handles their retinues as a sequence of entries through a symmetrical arrangement of scenic devices, two city gates on either side of the palace door. The scheme gives one brother the appearance of peaceful intentions in contrast to the other's bellicosity. We can recall from Chapter I, that in Act I Jocasta herself "issues" from the palace with her large retinue of twenty-one attendants. As Act II, Scene i, begins, Polynices enters through the gates of Homoloydes,

> accompanied with vj gentlemen and a page that carried his helmet and a Target: he & his men unarmed saving their gorgets, for that they were permitted to come into the towne in time of truce. . . .
>
> (II, Dumb Show, 15-18)

When Eteocles arrives, by the opposite Electra gate, twenty men in armour and two pages precede him. Eteocles himself is armed (II, i, 240).

The techniques of delineating the badness or goodness of royal figures by modeling them on the Christian Prince and the Tyrant led some Tudor dramatists to augment the two fundamental choices of royalty's moral "character" with a third possibility. This third choice opened up a range of opportunities to inventive genius and personal vision. It derives from the two peculiar principles of moral parallelism already mentioned in this chapter.

One of these principles that leads to a third option in presenting a king figure's moral status is that a character may shift from one basic moral category to another. His badness or his goodness may change. He may begin with the traits appropriate to the Tyrant. Initially, Chester's Emperor Octavian brags like Herod. The Three Princes of Ludus Coventriae appear at first in the ranks of the wicked. Because of the subsequent actions of these figures of royalty, we revise our judgment of their moral type to good. So also, the Four Kings in Chester's Antichrist episode start out by expressing loyalty to Christ, only to change their minds under Antichrist's suasions. Finally, they revert once more to goodness, and we give them good marks at the end.

The effect of changeability of a king figure's moral type, from Tyrant to Christian Prince, or from Christian Prince to Tyrant, is to induce us to more or less suspend our moral judgment of them for a time. We have new information. What we thought was so, no longer is so. Thomas Preston forces upon the audience a suspension of judgment in the course of his Cambyses King of Persia. King Cambises seems to change during the play from possibly good to definitely horrid. He returns from his wars to hear from Commons Complaint that his deputy has ruled unjustly. Cambises' royal decree punishes Sisamnes with death, a judgment which, if harsh, seems defensible as a demonstration of the king's compassion for his subjects. Thereafter, however, Cambises indulges in one wilful cruelty after another. He becomes thoroughly bad, a type of Tyrant, without doubt. Perhaps, an Ambidexter observes in passing, Cambises did not really change his moral state at all:

> The king himselfe was godly up trained:
> He professed vertue, but I think it was fained.
> He plaies with both hands, good deeds and ill.
> (sig. D1$^{r}$)

The suggestion that Cambises may have imitated goodness brings us to our other principle, also observed earlier, that one kind of moral character may be a transformation of another kind. The bad may imitate the good, and the good may impersonate evil. Chester's Antichrist, an evil imitator of divine majesty, was one pretender. Herod's pretensions to hospitality, for instance, or to legitimate succession, are similar. And of Ludus Coventriae's Three Princes in the Assumption of the Virgin pageant, it is at least possible that two may have pretended to be wickedly unchristian in order to outmaneuver a third who was genuinely bad, and dangerous.

Again, the sense that the dramatist is presenting an imitation of a moral type of royalty persuades us to hold our judgment of a character in suspense. Like the uncertainty we feel when a king figure changes his moral "character," the uncertainty evoked by his imitation of a moral type raises questions. We want to know what else lies behind the conventional kingly behaviour and decorum which composes the formal surface pattern of morality in so many Tudor plays. It is this questioning, this demand for suspended judgment, that constitutes the third moral possibility that the dramatists explored, beyond the simple badness and obvious goodness of the Tyrant and the Christian Prince.

In their *Jocasta*, Gascoigne and Kinwelmersh furnish a convenient example of the kind of drama that elicits a questioning response to the conventional moral categories represented in formal parallelisms of a play. Because the formal patterns exist in *Jocasta*, and are sharply drawn and underscored, we notice all the more forcibly small contradictions in the symmetrical scheme.

A moment ago, we had occasion to notice the balanced groups of characters, the retinues of Polynices and Eteocles which dramatized them as the Christian Prince and the Tyrant. Another kind of symmetry is superimposed on this moral dichotomy. Jocasta, the Queen, seems to stand in the balance between the princes. She holds out in Thebes, from her palace in the centre of the stage. The city is now besieged, inside and out, by the warring brothers whom she hopes to conciliate. Jocasta expresses impartiality toward her sons. She wants their old agreement restored:

> They to avoyde the wicked blasphemies,
> And sinfull prayer of their angrie sire,
> Agreed thus, that of this noble realme,
> Untill the course of one ful yere was runne,
> *Eteocles* should sway the kingly mace,
> And *Polynice* as exul should departe,
> Till time expyrde: and then to *Polynice*
> *Eteocles* should yeelde the scepter up:
> Thus yere by yere the one succeeding other,
> This royall crowne should unto bothe remayne.
> (I, i, 160-169)

She is a "pitifull mother/Whom nature binds to love hir loving sonnes" (I, i, 190-191). If the princes fail to agree, "Alas, I feare. . . /That one, or both shall purchase death thereby" (I, i, 187-188). She will entreat them both to leave off their battle until their wraths have cooled.

By the time the parley begins, the nice kind of symmetry in arrangements of characters, and in the expression of Jocasta's sentiments encourages an expectation that a formal parallelism between the brothers will continue. The parallelism does, indeed, continue, but it becomes the background for the impact of their visible contrast, once they can be seen together in Act II. The two contingents, one small and unarmed, the other large and armed, seem a sudden revelation that Polynices is more peaceful, and hence good, while Eteocles is more warlike, and therefore bad.

Yet is this revelation all so sudden? Or does it simply clinch our convictions? Much that has gone before in this play has been a subtle preparation to put one young king in a different light from another. Eteocles, says Jocasta, is the brother who broke the agreement (I, i, 171-174). Under the circumstances, according to Jocasta, "poore Polynices" could not have done anything else but seek help to besiege Thebes (I, i, 175-183).

> Eteocles thus plast in princely seate,
> Drunke with the sugred taste of kingly raigne,
> Not onely shut his brother from the crowne,
> But also from his native country soyle.
> (I, i, 171-174)

Moreover, Jocasta already has word from Polynices that he will come in peaceful array to the parley. Only now, she sends an invitation to

Eteocles to come. Her emissary despairs aloud of his errand's successful outcome (I, i, 262).

The case against Eteocles builds up in Antigone's scene, I, ii. The princes' sister, also entering from the central palace, wishes for peace between the two brothers. But the real reasons she gives for venturing out into a town swarming with armed men is that she may glimpse the brother she loves (I, ii, 22-23; 34-40). "Sweete Polynice" is her favorite, while, to her, Eteocles is a "trothlesse tyrant" (I, ii, 91). She fears Polynices will fall into a trap (I, ii, 69-71).

Even the Chorus, the detachment of ladies belonging to Jocasta's retinue, takes sides with Polynices as the brother of "lesse disdaine" (I, Chor., 45), in verses furnished by Francis Kinwelmershe. Gascoigne permits these ladies to intrude in Act II to praise Polynices:

> O woorthie impe sprong out of worthie race,
> Renowmed Prince, whom wee have lookt for long,
> And nowe in happie houre arte come to us,
> Some quiet bring to this unquiet realme.
> O queen, O queene, come foorth and see thy sonne,
> The gentle frute of all thy joyfull seede.
> (II, i, 32-37)

The reunion between mother and son is a touching one, Polynices exhibiting a fine sensitivity to Jocasta's feelings. In spite of the many symmetrical effects that make them seem equals, by the time the two brothers draw up face to face, we are ready to think of them in terms of a moral dichotomy heavily weighted in one brother's favour. What seems a revelation as to their moral types was in fact prompted by the piling up of testimony from other characters, whose favoritism belies a superficial fairness. So far, then, nearly everybody we have met in Thebes likes Polynices. They do not like his brother.

Only one account of Polynices contradicts the glamour of goodness put upon his coming, and the effect of goodness he himself generates when he arrives. The account is in a speech Kinwelmersh gave to Bailo, governor to the princes and Antigone. He has just come from Polynices' camp in I, ii. To please Antigone, Bailo describes her brother's brilliant appearance. Polynices is a most magnificent prince, surrounded by other princes:

> Harde by the King I spied Polynice,
> In golden glistring armes most richely cladde,
> Whose person many a stately prince enpalde,
> And many a comely crowned head enclosde.
> (I, ii, 156-159)

And the splendid Polynices is human:

> At sight of me his colour straight he chaungde,
> And like a loving childe, in clasped armes
> He caught me up, and frendly kist my cheke.
> (I, ii, 160-162)

Polynices gladly gives consent to his mother's request, which was Bailo's errand, and he asks fondly after his sisters, Antigone in particular.

But the disturbing note in Bailo's otherwise glorious report has to do with the power of men in Polynices' train. They include the "floure of Grece," the foreigners whom Polynices, as Adrastus's son-in-law, has persuaded to take up his cause. These are the forces that now besiege Thebes:

> Whose hugie traine so mightie seemes to be,
> As I see not, how this our drouping towne
> Is able to withstand so strong a siege.
> (I, ii, 142-144)

The massed armies, Bailo says, present a formidable appearance:

> In battailes seaven the host devided is,

> To eche of which, by order of the king,
> A valiant knight for captaine is assignde:
> And as you know this citie hath seven gates,
> So everie captaine hath his gate prescribde,
> With fierce assault to make his entrie at.
> (I, ii, 148-153)

A force like that adds something substantial to our picture of a peaceful Polynices. Polynices' peaceable manner in Act II not only contrasts with Eteocles' belligerence -- or prudence -- but it contradicts Bailo's report of the offstage Polynices.

Is Polynices the type of Christian Prince he seems to be, or a competent imitator of the good? And what of Eteocles, whose kin in Thebes, underneath their show of balanced reason, persist in thinking of him as Tyrant? How does Jocasta's own rather large retinue, the twelve gentlemen presumably still inside the palace now, how do they affect matters? Remembering Bailo's report, we must reserve judgment on the two princes. Their moral status, good or bad, may be quite otherwise than what it seems. They may represent the playwrights' third choice in representing the moral nature of royalty, constructing a paradox of moral types that raises more questions than can be answered here.

In expressing variations on the conventional moral dichotomy, formal parallelism allows a figure of royalty to change his moral status either by changing his own "mind," or by making us change ours about him. Formal parallelism makes noticeable, by encouraging comparisons, the subtlest departure from the balanced and repeated components of design. From the basic moral dichotomy which distinguishes the Christian Prince from the Tyrant, as the good and bad types of ruler, to the construction of the ambiguous and volatile princes of the Tudor stage whose motives seem almost fathomless, formal parallelism was essential to the artistry by which the Tudor dramatist presented his vision of royalty's moral nature.

This ends our discussion of the techniques Tudor dramatists employed in representing the moral condition of their king figures. We have next to see how the dramatists further developed the personalities of their stage royalty by dramatizing them as social beings, a phase of characterization which, while not entirely separable from the moral definition of "character," nevertheless lends itself to a special discussion.

# Chapter IV

There is generally a good deal more to a Tudor stage king than a few standard marks of princeliness and a sovereign style can show. The stage king is usually more, also, than the elementary goodness or badness, more than the changeable morals his creator might decide to give him. Except that some playwrights -- Thomas Kyd, for instance, writing The Spanish Tragedy -- might choose, for reasons of their own, to compose a showpiece of a Christian Prince, an effigy instead of a portrait of a royal "personality," the representation of a princely figure in Tudor drama nearly always included traits that refined, detailed, and complicated him as a social being.

While exploring the portrayal of stage royalty as social "characters" we shall be noticing along the way some procedures similar to those defining the princely moral type. Although the dramatist could "socialize" his kings by giving them certain traits, his figures of royalty could also acquire social "character" from connections with other personae in the play. And sometimes formal parallelism contributed to the social definition of the king. But in making the stage king akin to the rest of society, and in defining him as a member of the social world, the dramatist turned to the earth-bound souls beneath the king -- royalty's "subjects," so to speak -- to find the traits to make a king a recognizable kind of man. We shall begin the discussion of socializing kings by examining these other personae first.

Because Sixteenth Century audiences accepted much "typifying" of character through costume, acting and speech, [1] we shall be using the word type now to mean a stage character with conventional traits. Type in this sense, as professional dramatists use it, had important connotations for Sixteenth Century drama when the conventional characters of the European stage developed, including the familiar figures of commedia dell'arte. Social types furnished roles which, while they could be individualized by actors and dramatists who employed them in their shows, conformed to widely recognized conventions which made their "character" quickly known.

"Why likes thee so the tipe of tyrannie," Gascoigne's Jocasta asks King Eteocles (Jocasta, II, i, 438), as if the type were a role one played, the acting out of royal villainy through well-known conventions of behaviour. In this sense, type often overlapped with figure, meaning picture or image, as Sir Thomas Elyot used the word when he described dice-playing as the figure of idleness. [2] Before the end of this chapter, however, we shall notice how our two meanings of the word type converge: type, as in Chapter II, meaning likeness or copy, and type as here, denoting a conventional social "character," a role for an actor to play.

Besides the ordinary figures of royalty, and the superhuman and abstract characters treated as versions of royalty, a host of representative social types peopled Tudor stages and playing places: the outlaw, the thief, the soldier, the peasant, the executioner, the bishop, the courtier, the churl, and the saint, to name but a few. Some, like the king figure himself, and the doctor, the fool, the peddler, and the messenger, angelic or otherwise, seem to have survived obscurely in folk plays through the centuries when professional playing must have all but ceased.[3] Prophets, female shrews, shepherds, gardeners, carpenters, stewards, and monks are more typical of late medieval dramatic art, which drew upon Scripture, and on town and country life for dramatic types. Social changes produced the tax-collector, the beadle, the sheriff, the farmer, and the lawyer as stage characters. Political and economic changes encouraged the appearance of magistrates, weavers, potters, and cobblers, as well as assorted commoners distinguished by their "dialects," whether Flemish, French, or provincial English.

Renaissance taste, which fostered new supernatural characters, among them fairies, nymphs, and witches; cupids, goddesses, and ghosts, particularly in court drama and royal entertainments, also brought forth hermits and beggars, madmen and poets, magicians and magnificos. The prostitute, the nurse, and the parasite or glutton, were legacies of the classical revival important for the popular stage, too. The character of the actor, however, was probably the most valuable Renaissance contribution to the repertoire of theatre personae assembled by English dramatists in Tudor times.

But these "occupational" types of stage characters, like the king figure in his simplest form, were defined mainly through their functions in the action, their names, costumes, the props they carried with them, and their conventional decorum and style of speech. Dramatists and actors individualized them further by resorting to types of another category, those portraying the abstract qualities of human nature. In this other class of characters were typical "personalities," conventionalized by moralizing poets and rhetoricians. Some were personified vices after the example of Alexander Barclay's illustrated version of The Ship of Fools (1509),[4] or were recommended as devices of persuasive rhetoric in the Copia (1512) that Erasmus wrote for Tudor school boys at St. Paul's school.[5] Some types were personifications of the human virtues, vices, follies, and pleasures, like those Elyot treated in his practical guide to conduct, The Boke named The Governour,[6] still others were caricatures of the sort enlivening farce in France.[7] There were also characters defined by social relationships: the old man and the lusty youth, the lover and the beloved, the father and the son, the friend and the rival, the master and the servant, and so on. The innumerable published dialogues modeled on the Socratic method were models, in turn, for the verbal exchanges identifying the man of reason, virtue, and learning in the plays.

With this swelling crowd at his beck, the Tudor dramatist had plenty to work with in depicting the king as a social being on the stage. He could simply characterize him with traits already recognizable as belonging to certain kinds of men. It is hardly likely that any such creature as a "pure" type actually appeared on the English stage. Tudor dramatists handled convention with a sense of its plasticity, and their gifts in this line made their figures of royalty convincing members of the social scene.[8]

Tudor dramatists of every generation dramatized king characters by giving them the traits and functions of conventional social types. The "character" of the soldier was susceptible to a wide range of treatments when incorporated into kingly stage portraits, from Peele's Longshanks, who in King Edward the First appears as a version of the valourous soldier, to the braggart warrior, sometimes a facet of Herod. Here is the old ranter in Herod's Killing of the Children, boasting of his prowess in war:

> I Am kyng herowdes, . . .
> most strong and myghty • in feld to fyght,
> And to venquysshe my enemyes • that a-geynst me do;
> I am most be-dred • with my bronde bright.
> . . . . . . . . . . . . .
> . . . no conquerour nor knight • is comparid to me.
> (I, 61-68)

But, to use another example, a Tudor stage king could also be any one of many kinds of judges. Like a petty magistrate, Ludus Coventriae's Herod judges Jesus on charges of lawbreaking and sorcery (30: 380-384, 427). The council of gentlemen that King Assuerus assembles in Godly Queen Hester to discourse upon the "most worthy honoure to attayne" (16), allows the king to be a judge of philosophic truths. King Darius, who calls a contest of orators, is the judge of honesty in eloquence (King Darius, sig. B2$^r$ - H3$^r$). Longshanks judges the Scottish nobles' quarrel in King Edward the First. The king serving justice as a faction healer was another variation of the judge. The dying King Edward IV in The True Tragedy of Richard the Third asks rival lords to cease their quarrels for the sake of civil order:

> . . . let me intreate you to imbrace each other,
> That at my last departure you may send my soule
> To the joyes celestiall:
> For leaving behinde me my yoong sonne,
> Your lawfull King after my decease,
> May be by your wise and grave counsell so governed,

> Which no doubt may bring comfort
> To his famous realme of England.
>
> (97-104)

The queen mother's mediating efforts in Gascoigne's and Kinwelmersh's Jocasta are in the same tradition of the peace-making functions of royalty as judge.

The same king figure handled by different dramatists, even within the same drama, could have various casts of "character," depending upon how his royal traits conformed to those of conventional social types. The two Herods of Ludus Coventriae, historically different rulers, have common characteristics, it is true. This fact is important for the cycle as a whole: kings of the same name have a sufficient "continuousness" to contribute to the dramatists' design. Both of Ludus Coventriae's Herods are boasters, and both express violent natures (18: 6-7; 20: 10-11; 29 b: 11-16). They conform to the pattern of Tyrant.

But one Herod's performance as a judge in a sequence of moot court trials during the episodes of the Passion (29), makes him seem a "character" distinct from the earlier Herod of the Nativity.[9] The first Herod, at least partly the product of more than one dramatist, still has traces of an old-time Lollard in his speech (18: 73-74, 88; 20: 11). His changes of clothing (18: 20, 69-70) mark him distinctively as a dandy, too, and his banquet (20: 141-284) makes him a voluptuary. More of these two Herods later. The point now is that they are each slightly different from each other, and from their counterparts in other plays. The Coventry Shearmen and Taylors' dramatists allowed their Herod to dilate more than usual on his pretensions to divine power (493-501, 517). They also gave him a devout interest in "truage" on merchant ships (524) and in the technicalities of passports (670-673). And, they wrote him this little passage to indicate that he also represents Sloth, one of the deadly sins:

> And the whyle thatt I do resst,
> Trompettis, viallis, and other armone
> Schall bles the wakyng of my majeste.
>
> (537-539)

The Chester Nativity Herod has the characteristics typical of the drunkard. A long speech sets him craving for wine:

> This bost dothe me so great annoy
> that I wax dull and pure drye;
> have done and fill the wyne in hye!
> I dye but I have a drinke.
>
> (VIII, 406-409)

Wine reinvigorates him:

> Fill fast and let the cuppes flye,
> and goe we hethen hastely,
> for I must ordayne Quintely
> against theis Kinges Cominge.
>
> (VIII, 410-413)

While the motives behind such fine differences of characterization may seem obscure at first, these varying treatments of Herod are a foretaste of the versatility to be found in the Tudor dramatists' techniques of portraying royalty on stage.

Without succumbing to the temptations of digression we should note here, for future reference, that extraordinary figures of majesty could have social traits, too, if dramatists chose to touch their "characters" with the marks of conventional social types. An example is the Chester Antichrist, who says:

> One thing me glades, be you bould,
> as Daniell the prophett afore me towld:
> all women in the world me love should,
> When I were come in land.
>
> (The Chester Plays,
> XXIII, 41-44)

Thus, the demon reveals himself to be wanton and voluptuous. The Chester dramatists also enhanced their Deus with social traits. Deus is recognizable as the "friend." To Lucifer, who has usurped his throne, Deus asks:

> what have I offended unto thee?
> I made thee my frende, thou arte my foe!
> whie hast thou trespassed thus to me?
> Above all Angells there were no mo
> that sate so nighe the majestye.
>
> (The Chester Plays, I, 202-206)

Here, rhetorical questions have elaborated the treatment to make Deus into an injured friend. How such socializing details in characters of extraordinary power could affect the portraits of proper kings will be appearing further on.

That the handling of conventions for depicting social types of "character" makes immense variety in the characterization of stage royalty is all too easy to demonstrate. More challenging are the definition of the methods and description of techniques important for dramatizing kings. One method, already illustrated in the examples of the kingly judges, is to involve the figure of royalty in a dramatic situation in which he enacted the function of another type of persona. Another method was to insert lines in a kingly character's speeches to suggest the social facets of his character. The Chester Herod's demands for wine are of this second order. A third method, not always easy to distinguish from the insertion, was the indecorous lapse.

Sometimes a Tudor stage king drops his royal style to adopt the formulas of speech conventionally associated with incongruous types of characters. The lapse affects his own "character" accordingly, and we understand his actions in terms of the social type he mirrors for the moment. Tudor dramatists could employ the indecorous lapse in a simple form. Chester's Herod, for example, uses one of the curses peculiar to the vice (VIII, 342 and 390), and King Richard uses another in The True Tragedy of Richard the Third:

> Gogs wounds who is that? search the villaine, has he
> any dags about him?
>
> (1600-1601).

All the double dealings and manipulations of plot of which the Tudor vice was capable instantly come to mind when a royal figure uses such language.

Not much more complicated than these treatments is the indecorous lapse that the dramatists of Mary Magdalene devised for the King of Marcyll. The Queen formally begs a boon of her royal spouse:

> Now, worshepfull lord, of a bone I yow pray,
> And it be pleȝeyng to yower hye dygnite.
>
> (II, 39, 1694-1695)

The king replies with perfect decorum:

> Madam, yower dysyer on-to me say.
> what bone is þat ȝe desyer of me?
>
> (II, 39, 1696-1697)

The queen's wish is that she, too, may go to the Holy Land to be made a Christian. The king is shocked out of his dignity:

> A-las! þe wyttes of wommen, how þey byn wylld!
> And þer-of fallytt many a chanse.
> A! why desyer it? and you ar with chyld.
>
> (II, 39, 1702-1704)

The king's lapse from one set of conventions into another adds another dimension to his "character." The king is reduced to the type of the ordinary husband with an ordinary wife. As ordinarily happens, she soon gets her own way. The passage quoted is part of the dramatists' strategy in bringing a pompous pagan king under the rule of Christ.

Much more ambitious is the indecorous lapse of the princely hero of John Bale's King Johan. In that play, the device throws the king figure into a situation in which he enacts roles unsuitable for his function as a prince. After he concludes his first speech, the one which announces his sovereignty, godly authority, and rightful succession, Kyng Johan forgets that he is a king with obligations to behave accordingly. So prolonged is his lapse from conventional royal dignity and authority that he risks being taken for a dull-witted citizen dressed up with crown and scepter. A closer look at his neglect of formalities appropriate to sovereigns will help us appreciate the artistry which makes him the kind of king he is.

Besides his rather indifferent marks of royalty, and the treatment which defines him as a Christian Prince, Kyng Johan has traits which identify him as being two sorts of social character. His strangely bookish "personality" emerges first. He encounters other characters with the air of a gentleman lately exposed, to the New Learning, and now seeking the truth of things by asking questions. Johan's style of conversation is one which, in the Sixteenth Century, turned nearly every subject worth knowing, from love to archery, into a printed formal dialogue between two fictitious friends. Like the discoursing gentlemen in books, Kyng Johan questions Ynglond as if to draw forth knowledge, little by little: "tell me whom thou menyst, to satysfy my mynd" (A: 35), he says, or, "why dost thou thus, compare hym to a swyne" (A: 77). His technique is the same for discoursing with others. In the presence of the vices, however, Johan seems absent-minded, or hard-of-hearing: "what is thy name, tell me yett onys agayne" (A: 187).

Whatever Johan disapproves of he dismisses sanctimoniously as of inferior wisdom:

> why, know ye it not; the prechyng of þe gospell
> take to ye yowr traysh, yowr ryngyng syngyng & pypyng
> so þt we may have, the scrypture openyng
> but þt we can not have, yt stondyth not wt yowr avantage.
> (A: 1388-1391)

He reproves vice by correction:

> Thou canst wt thy myrth, in no wysse dyscontent me
> so that thow powder yt, wt wysdom & honeste.
> (A: 48-49)

As the conspiracy of the vices takes shape, Johan utters idle threats. The only show of force he can muster is an "Avant pevysh prist" (A: 1341), or, "we wyll short ther hornys, yf god send tyme & space" (A: 229). Often, he is merely stuffy: "the devyll go wt hym, þe unthryftye knave is gon" (A: 314).

King Johan believes himself to be a man of reason, and he is at pains to prove truths by disputation, instead of acting on the evidence of reality. He pursues knowledge single-mindedly, regardless of what happens: "how am I defylyd, telme good gentyll mate" (A: 1421). Notice of his excommunication exasperates him, but only because it does not square with his holy knowledge:

> oh mercyfull god, what an unwyse clawse ys this:
> of hym that shuld se, þt nothyng ware amys
> that sentence or curse, þt scriptur doth not dyrect
> in my opynyon, shall be of non effecte.
> (A: 1427-1430)

Even in a tight spot, accused of heresy by his own magistracy, Civil Order, Johan maintains his show of orderly thinking, pedantically listing scriptural authorities to demonstrate the rightness of his rule (A: 1395-1414). "Prove yt by scriptur, & than wyll I yt alowe," is the guiding policy of Kyng Johan's governance (A: 1432).

The vices press this ineffectual king into submission, but Johan never flinches: "And what do ye meane, by such an hurly burlye?" (B: 1630). Finally, without hysterics he gives in, because "ther ys no remedy" (B: 1688):

> here I submyt me, to pope Innocent the thred
> dyssyering mercy, of his holy fatherhed.
> (B: 1646-1647)

About this time, Kyng Johan begins to show another side of himself. He becomes emotional, even impassioned, thanks to the speeches Bale gave him in the manuscript's last revision, about 1560.[10] The king's firm pedantry gives way as he contemplates the disasters in store for the English: "The losse of people, styketh most unto my harte" (B: 1752). A new conventional "character," the lover-citizen compounded in the poetry of Nicholas Grimald,[11] pours forth his patriotic anguish:

> O Englande, Englande, shewe now thyself a mother
> Thy people wyll els, be slayne here without nomber
> As God shall judge me, I do not thys of cowardnesse
> But of compassyon, in thys extreme heavynesse
> Shall my people shedde, their bloude in suche habundaunce:
> Naye, I shall rather, gyve upp my whole governaunce.
> (B: 1734-1739)

Giving up the crown, Kyng Johan grows resigned, and more spiritual. Everyone but Ynglond is against him (B: 2002-2006). He wants to die, that his soul may find bliss with God: "swete lorde delyver me/ and preserve thys realme, of thy benygnyte!" (B: 2036-2037). He puts up a last brief resistance by reforming the coinage, but after that, the vices gleefully destroy him.

Superficially, Kyng Johan is good, but his long lapse into the ways of impractical "characters" make him an impolitic fool, doomed to failure. Neither of his two "sides" as a social type is useful to a king. His pious pedantry is unrealistic, and his patriotic fervor shows lack of control, coming too late to be effective. For all his bookishness, he has not read -- or does not understand -- Elyot's The Governour, which could have informed him that virtue, learning, and passion are, for the ideal gentleman of the Sixteenth Century, tools of statesmanship.[12] Johan can only make a pretense of being king. When he recovers a little of the royal style, using rhyme royal stanzas for a soliloquy (A: 1277-1304), he is using a device even the vices imitate (A: 945-958; 959-979).[13] He loses the realm to the Pope, and no wonder. In the hands of John Bale, the indecorous lapse takes satire to the borders of tragedy, because it involves the king in situations in which his "human nature" is disastrously flawed through the dramatist's choice of social conventions.

A fourth important method of dramatizing the social "character" and significance of princely characters in Tudor drama was the manipulation of costume. Costuming technique might be as simple as a change of garments for royalty during the play. That is how Lodge and Greene made a dandy of their King Rasni in A Looking-Glass for London and England. Rasni and his lords arrive on stage "in pomp" (514), followed by the court magician, who is in "great pompe." At once, Rasni bethinks himself of further splendour, and off he goes during the magic show to change his suit. The Ludus Coventriae dramatists treat their Herod similarly, as we know, to impress the audience with the idea of his large wardrobe backstage.

If, as often happened in Tudor plays, the dramatist chose to make an issue of the social significance of clothing in dramatizing royalty, costumery and other paraphernalia were implicated in the dramatic action of the play. Peele uses costume and finery lavishly, in spectacle and in speech, to make the extravagance and pride of Queen Elinor, daughter of the King of Spain, one of the unifying elements of King Edward the First. Setting the coronation date puts Elinor in a flutter:

> Alas my Lord, the time is all too short
> And sudden, for so great solemnitie:
> A yeare were scarse enough to set a worke,
> Tailers, Imbroderes, and men of rare device,
> For preparation of so great estate.
> Trust me sweete Ned, hardlie shal I bethinke me,
> In twentie weekes what fashion robes to weare,
> I pray thee then deferre it till the spring,
> That we may have our garments point device.
> I meane to send for Tailers into Spain,
> . . . . . . . . . . .
> What? let me brave it now or never Ned.
> (221-233)

She expresses her flamboyant tastes in her grand entry into Wales where she is to give birth to the prince:

> The trumpets sound, Queene Elinor in hir litter borne by foure Negro Mores, Jone of Acon with her, attended on by the Earle of Glocester, and her foure footemen, one having set a ladder to the side of the litter. she discended, and her daughter followeth.
>
> (1102-1106)

As she steps out of her litter, the Queen calls for her pantables and a fan. She hands her mask to Gloucester with a warning not to crush it. She is hot, thirsty, tired, and irritable, and remembers grander circumstances that make boggy Wales seem ugly and rough by contrast:

> I tel thee the ground is all to base,
> For Elinor to honor with her steps:
> Whose footepace when shee progrest in the streete,
> Of Aecon and the faire Jerusalem,
> Was nought but costly Arras points:
> Faire Iland tapestrie and Azured silke,
> My milke white steed treading on cloth of ray,
> And trampling proudly underneath the feete,
> Choise of our English wollen drapery.
> (1122-1130)

It is Longshanks's intention to have the prince born a Welshman, an objective that brings about a clash of Spanish pride with English diplomacy. As a token of good will, the Welsh barons have sent the new Prince of Wales a "mantle of frize richlie lined to keep him warm" (1760). But Queen Elinor will have none of this cheap goods made for home trade in the British isles:

> A mantle of frize, fie fie for Gods sake let me here
> no more of it and if you love me, fie my lorde is this
> the wisedome and kindnes of the countrey?
> (1761-1763)

The Welsh are a witless and unmannerly lot to clothe a king's son in frieze. Elinor's boy deserves better. He should "glister like the Sommers Sunne in robes as rich as Jove when he triumphes" (1775-1777). "For God sake laie it up charilie, and perfume it against winter. . ." (1787-1788). Chagrinned, the ever-politic king appeals covertly to the ladies-in-waiting. He even threatens reprisals against his daughter, Jone, should the baby not be smuggled to the ceremony in his plain Welsh robe (1879-1886).

The disguise was a means by which Tudor dramatists complicated the social characterization of royalty through costume. On the eve of the Battle of Bosworth, in The True Tragedy of Richard the Third, the Earl of Richmond, whose nightly habit is to "scout abroad" in disguise (1810-1811), secretly and incognito meets his sympathizer, Standley. The device emphasizes Richmond's nervousness about betrayal, balancing Richard's private admissions of fear (1898). It reveals the weak ground on which Richmond "presumes" to the throne, and the uncertainty of his adventure's outcome until he has Standley's promised help. The disguise also establishes Richmond as pretending to be something he is not, a point he has in common with Richard, as we shall see.

It is no surprise to find Peele using the disguise enthusiastically, more than once in the same play, in fact, and with quite different effects on his princely figures' social "character" in each case. For several scenes of King Edward the First, Lluellen, the deposed Prince of Wales, and his band of rebels, play Robin Hood. They wander "like irregulers up and down the wildernesse," the Prince himself affecting to be a "maister of misrule" (1398-1300). The costumery, song, wit, and play-acting that go with the pretense endow Lluellen with the glamour of a popular outlaw hero, in sympathy with the commonfolk of Wales.

Longshanks also adopts a disguise in the same play. But when the over-curious king and his brother, Edmund, dress like friars to hear the dying Queen's confession, the deception reduces Longshanks from valourous soldier and fair-dealing sovereign to the typical cuckolded husband. Among the Queen's guilty recollections is the occasion, long ago, when she and Edmund had been lovers. Trying to maintain face at this disclosure, one pretended friar, now shown to be a traitor, exclaims:

> Madam, through sickenes, weakenes, and your wittes, twere verie good to bethinke your selfe before you speake
> (2758-2760)

When the worst of the news is out, the unhappy king is done with masquerade: "Hence faigned weedes, unfaigned is my griefe" (2800).

We said earlier that figures of royalty could acquire details of their social nature, as they could their moral type, from their connections with other characters in the same drama. The associates of royalty provided a fifth method by which Tudor dramatists elaborated the princely figure's social significance with conventional characteristics. First, there were the king's immediate associates with "characters" of their own delineated by convention and who enriched the "character" of the king. Herod of Ludus Coventriae keeps a steward whose "occupation" contributes to our impression of Herod as an epicure. Longshanks, of Peele's King Edward the First, appears in the company of his wounded, but victorious, crusaders, who reflect still more glory upon their warrior king. One of the Chester Herods is a patron of spiritual learning, referring questions of government to a Doctor who is "chief of Cleargie" (The Chester Plays, VIII, 225), but Mary Magdalene's Herod, who is a patron of philosophers (I, 6, 164), seems a degree more sophisticated in his pretensions to knowledge. The page who serves Richard in The True Tragedy of Richard III, functions as a spy and parasite, which tells us something of the "character" of his master.

The revelations of a king figure's associates have much to do with how we estimate his social "character." Even before the king appears in Christopher Marlowe's Edward the Second, his favorite, Gavestone, has sketched the royal "character" as the type of the wanton king. Here is Gavestone, planning the new style of court life:

> I must have wanton Poets, pleasant wits,
> Musitians, that with touching of a string
> May draw the pliant king which way I please:
> Musicke and poetrie is his delight,
> Therefore ile have Italian maskes by night,
> Sweete speeches, comedies, and pleasing showes,
> And in the day when he shall walke abroad,
> Like Silvian Nimphes my pages shall be clad,
> My men like Satyres grazing on the lawnes,
> Shall with their Goate feete daunce an antick hay,
> . . . . . . . . . . .
> Such things as these best please his majestie.
> (54-74)

We know even more about the king's social "character" when we see how he interacts with other personae. John Bale made Ynglond the king's faithful companion in his King Johan. She evokes a patriotic sympathy for the king, and characterizes him as a friend of the English commonweal. But Ynglond's influence on Johan is not all of a piece. This personified abstraction of a nation often slips into low language and lewd conversations (A: 69-86). She has at least as much interest in material wealth as in spiritual good. The scriptural grounds of her arguments are sometimes loosely employed:

> . . . they take from me, my cattell howse & land
> my wode & pasturs, wt other commodyteys
> lyke as christ ded saye, to þe wyckyd pharyseys
> pore wydowys howsys, ye grosse up by long prayers.
> (A: 62-65)

Worse, she tends to give the king orders:

> commaund this felow, to avoyd I yow beseche
> for dowȝtles he hath, don me great Injury.
> (A: 92-93)

Servilely, Johan complies: "a voyd lewd felow, or thow shalt rewe yt truly" (A: 94). Ynglond's influence on Kyng Johan shows him to be weak and undiscriminating, two more details in the composition of his "character" as a fool in king's livery.

The revelations of the king's associates might well contradict the impression royalty makes at other times. We have already seen King Edward IV, in The True Tragedy of Richard the Third, in the role of judge and peacemaker. But Jane Shore, his mistress, appears from time to time later on, in scenes counterpointing the action of Richard's villainous rule. In times past, she says, she had begged lands for this friend, obtained pardon for another. Now, since her lover's death, she is a beggar. Her speeches, in the rhetoric of charity, touch upon the sordid details of Edward's court:

> . . . when I was in my cheefest pomp, I thought that day wel spent wherein I might pleasure my friend by sutes to the King, for if I had spoken, he would not have said nay. For tho he was King, yet Shores wife swayd the swoord. I where neede was, there was I bountifull, and mindfull I was still uppon the poore to releeve them. . . .
> (1084-1090)

The impression of Edward as a sovereign seeking public harmony, arranging a league of friendship, is ruined. Even allowing for Shore's bragging, the scene of royal justice must have been but formal show, veiling the corruption of the king as another wanton prince.

A stage king might acquire some dimensions of his social "character" through connections with fairly remote figures in the same drama. When the dramatists of Mary Magdalene chose to be specific about the heathenism of the rulers of Marcyll, they took an indirect method of going about it, explaining them through characters with whom the king and queen never exchange a word. As the royal pair cross the playing place from their palace on the day of making sacrifices to their gods, the Presbyter and the Boy in the temple begin to play a scene that is a lewd and rowdy travesty of religious life and ritual. (II, 26 and 27). The proceedings of these two clowns characterize the devout worshippers as the gulls, or dupes, because of their superstitious faith in a fraudulent religion.

The king's associates who help define his social nature need not appear in the play at all. Stage royalty's conventional interest in genealogy, history, and myth serves the dramatists' purpose of showing a king figure's social "character." A simple statement might provide the connection. The Herod of the Coventry Shearmen and Taylors' pageant claims to be descended from Jupiter (517). Because of Jupiter's own associations with astrological mumbo-jumbo and an ancient paganism happily gone by, the audience gets a mixed and fleeting impression of an exotic, decadent, but darkly menacing necromancer.

Some allusions to the royal lineage work in such a complex and subtle manner that their full effect on the king's significance as a social being unfolds only with the action. Norton and Sackville's Gorboduc illustrates this kind of treatment of the king's social "character" through his mythological associates mentioned in the play. The old king must devise the succession upon his two sons in such a manner as to maintain the kingdom in an unbroken line of rule. In the portion of the play he wrote, Thomas Norton makes two of the king's councillors allude to Gorboduc's mythical forefather, "The mightie Brute, first prince of all this lande" (I, ii, 164, 270). The effect of an allusion to the ancient British king is to emphasize Gorboduc's obligation to maintain Brutus's line in its purity. If he acts correctly, Gorboduc will be a type or likeness of Brutus in the sense of copy. As the drama turns out, Gorboduc becomes the opposite of Brutus as reputed founder of the realm, and brings the kingdom to a catastrophic end. The treatment heightens the impression of Gorboduc's conventional irresponsibility in not heeding good advice.

Just the reverse of the technique found in Gorboduc is the Tudor dramatists' custom of associating the princely characters in their fabled histories on stage with living persons in the world outside the show. When Lodge and Greene put the Biblical character, the King of Ninivie, in their Looking-Glass for London and England, they chose "then, as now" as the motive of their didactic theme. A dolorous prophet, Oseas, sits suspended over the play's action, uttering frequent warnings to the spectators. "London looke on," he intones, "this matter nips thee neere" (284). The device reaches beyond the play with social criticism, defining royalty on stage as likenesses of sinful, ambitious Englishmen. Oseas is inviting Londoners to use their imaginations to complete Rasni's social characterization by thinking of the social climbers everybody knows.

Quite a different technique of complicating the royal social "character" by finding his associates outside the play is the allusion to Queen Elizabeth I in the coronation scene that ends The True Tragedy of Richard the Third. One of the characters of the play steps forward to speak of Richmond's granddaughter, the reigning monarch, as a "Mirrour in her age" (2192):

> She is that lampe that keeps faire Englands light,
> And through her faith her country lives in peace:
> And she hath put proud Antichrist to flight,
> And bene the meanes that civill wars did cease.
> (2202-2205)

This passage and the situation it graces, the battlefield crowning of Richmond as Henry VII, work in several ways to elaborate the social significance of the royal figures in the play. In the first place, the allusion to Antichrist in this dramatic "chronicle" refers to the Apocalyptic version of English history as a struggle between Christ and Antichrist,[14] which corresponded to the scheme already noticed in the contemporaneous redactions of The Chester Plays, also of the 1590s. Both versions, the English one sometimes called the Tudor myth, and the one found in The Chester Plays, emphasized pretended and true events leading to salvation. With the Tudor myth shaping the dramatist's design in The True Tragedy, King Richard has a similar structural function to Chester's Antichrist. He is a pretender, the defeated Tyrant. Richmond, the true and lawful king of England, is the character corresponding functionally to Chester's Christ. He is the triumphant Christian Prince. Modeled on the Christian history we see dramatized in The Chester Plays, the mythological version of England's past shed a holy light on the Tudor dynasty. The Tudor myth defined who was good and who was bad, by who was loyal and who a traitor to the monarchy, a moral dichotomy that was strictly England's own.

In addition, The True Tragedy's allusion to Elizabeth, coupled with the conceit of the mirror, made the living queen a type or likeness of her grandfather, whose heroic battle on the Field of Bosworth is enacted in the play. Richmond is Elizabeth's "prefiguration," so to speak. The dramatist's device of the pageant-like conclusion, with complimentary allusions to the Queen, knitted together the English past and present for the audience. The inference is that the characterization of Richmond in the play, as a certain social type, is applicable to a living personage beyond the drama's bounds. As for what, exactly, that royal characterization was supposed to be, we shall have to wait until we can further analyze the play.

The treatment of Gorboduc and Brutus, and the implication of Queen Elizabeth in The True Tragedy of Richard the Third involves us already in a fresh category of techniques that Tudor dramatists used to portray royal figures as social beings. The general method is that of formal parallelism, our sixth and final group of techniques for delineating royalty's social "character."

Chapter III described the moral dichotomy of characters in the cyclical drama as a scheme that characterized the personae as either good or bad. A drama's characters belonged to either of two opposed groups of moral types, those adhering to the divine figures, and those associated with the demons. We said that the moral scheme was the basis of the formal pattern in a drama's organization, and we emphasized the dramatists' opportunities of shifting their characters from one group to another. We have also just noticed a similar parallel scheme or moral dichotomy as it shapes a Tudor "chronicle" play in which the two opposing groups form round the Tyrant and the Christian Prince.

Now, we shall see that the same scheme of moral parallelism which defined characters as good or bad was sometimes useful, too, for delineating the king figure's social type. Royalty's moral associates could help define the social nature of a princely character in greater detail than the dramatist might allow the persona to display himself. This treatment of royalty could connect widely separated personae in the drama, characters linked by their moral type, even if they never encountered one another in the action. Sometimes, this treatment involved the social characterization of the superhuman figures as already illustrated several pages back.

Ludus Coventriae, a cyclical drama notable for the masterly handling of devices of formal parallelism, furnishes our first example of techniques elaborating a king figure's social characteristics through the personae associated with him chiefly through the patterns of the drama. One of this work's Herods, the Herod of the Nativity, is portrayed as a dandy, as we have said. He brags about his costume as he enters, and goes at once to change his clothes. This Herod has many other duties to perform in his pageant, and for reasons of dramatic economy, his dandyism gets no more special emphasis or elaboration as a particular social characteristic. However, one of his associates in the moral scheme of the drama makes a great exhibition of dandyism. This character is a demon who performs later on in an entertaining prologue to the first Passion Play. He declares himself to be a figure of royalty:

> I am ȝour lord lucifer þat out of helle cam
> Prince of þis werd • and gret duke of helle
> Wherefore my name is clepyd sere satan.
>
> (26: 1-3)

This "Norsshere of synne" (5), who promises to "Arere new Engynes • of malycious conspiracy" (50), is the most blatant dandy in a drama distinguished by several specimens of that type. "By-holde þe dyvercyte • of my dysgysyd varyauns" (65), he urges. His words are less a boast, than the opening of an oily sales pitch:

> Off ffyne cordewan, A goodly peyre of long pekyd schon
> hosyn enclosyd, of þe most costyous cloth • of Crenseyn
> Þus a bey to a jentylman • to make comparcion
> With two doseyn poyntys of cheverelle; þe Aglottys of sylver feyn.
> (26: 69-72)

On he goes, inventorying his finery: a fine holland shirt, the best stomacher money can buy, a stuffed doublet. Then he calls the roster of his new-named virtues and vices: "ȝe xal kalle pride • oneste • and naterall kend lechory/ And covetyse wysdam. . ." (111-112). Anyone can acquire a like elegance, pomp, and ease, and rid themselves of lice in the bargain:

> Gyff me ȝour love • grawnt me myn Affeccion
> And I wyl unclose • þe tresour of lovys Alyawns
> And gyff ȝow ȝoure desyrys afftere oure intencion
> no poverte xal aproche ȝow • fro pleneuous Abundauns.
> (26: 61-64)

He is out to win adherents from among the godly followers of Christ, who, he says, is nothing but a pretender. The virgin birth is a hoax (41). His motive: "þus xal I venge • be sotylte al my malycious grevauns" (59).

The transfigured Lucifer's performance adds a dimension to the other dandies in the drama. We begin to see Herod's dandyism as evidence that his membership in the company of the wicked is motivated by a wish for personal gain and glory, that he has been moved by Lucifer's persuasions. Herod seems to have voluntarily "sold out" to Lucifer.

Lucifer's expansion on dandyism allows us to see other parallels to the dandified Herod of the Nativity. His other distant connections include the Jews in the Passion episodes. Annas and Cayphas are ecclesiastical dandies. Annas is a prelate, a figure of substance:

> Here xal annas shewyn hym-self in his stage be-seyn after a busshop of þe hoold lawe in a skarlet gowne • and over þat a blew tabbard furryd with whyte and a mytere on his hed after þe hoold lawe • ij doctorys stondyng by him in furryd hodys and on be-forn hem with his staff of A-stat and eche of hem on here hedys a furryd cappe with a gret knop in þe crowne and on stondyng be-forn as a sarazyn þe wich xal be his masangere. . . .
>
> (26 b: 40)

Cayphas is a judge in an ecclesiastical court. He is as elegantly arrayed as Annas, but his tabbard is red. He has a similar retinue (26 c: 44). Each of the spiritual princes has a scaffold to himself on which to strut about.

Annas and Cayphas encounter Ludus Coventriae's second Herod who is sufficiently pompous on his scaffold. But the second Herod puts on no extraordinary display of dandyism of his own, for the very good reason that the princes of the church are more important than he:

> And þe herowdys scafald xal un-close shewyng herowdes in astat all þe jewys knelying • except Annas and cayphas þei xal stondyn. . . .
>
> (30: 366)

It is plain that the dramatists have been developing little by little, through parallels in social characterization, a detailed scheme of a hierarchy of evil power, expressed partly through the social type of the dandy. The first Herod is a forthright dandy, and the second, linked to him by other similarities of character, is but a dandy outshone. Both Herods have subordinate positions in the hierarchy to which they owe their loyalty and which allow them a certain show of elegance and power. The real authority belongs to Lucifer, the peddler of elegant wardrobes. After him rank the prelates. The episodic drama is held together, in part, then, by a network of characters, equated by their social characteristics as well as by their moral types. This network allows each his distinctive "degree" in a system that encompasses the significant features of social life, including the palace royalty, the courts, and the church, in ascending order of importance. In this scheme, royalty, as represented by the Herods, is far from the apex, the king's assertions to the contrary notwithstanding:

> I am a kynge of hyȝ degre
> þer xal non ben above me.
>
> (18: 179-180)

*Ludus Coventrae's* hierarchy of wicked elegance stands opposed to the simplicity of personae associated with Christ. The social characterization of royalty reinforces the scheme of moral parallelism defining characters as either good or bad. Other Tudor dramatists portrayed their king figures as social beings in such a way as to confound the fundamental moral pattern of the play.

We have already glanced at the Tudor version of the moral dichotomy which provides a structural organization for some characters of *The True Tragedy of Richard the Third*, defining Richard and Richmond as opposites of bad and good, the Tyrant and the Christian Prince. The playwright carries out this moral characterization of the two adversaries in many ways. Richard often speaks in a low style, for instance, and he performs wicked actions, while Richmond is on the whole gentlemanly and valourous.

But the dramatist has contradicted this simple moral scheme with another more complicated one, the idea of the Wheel of Fortune, a conception of history as a pattern of repeated rises and falls of rulers who are really much alike. This scheme, which the Renaissance inherited from medieval art and literature, was current in Renaissance England alongside the Tudor myth. It described princely figures one by one climbing to power and tumbling from estate as others succeeded them. We shall need to examine the playwright's handling of this scheme within his basic moral dichotomy in order to understand its implications for the social characterization of The True Tragedy's king figures.

Tudor Englishmen knew the Wheel of Fortune as a theory of royal history through Lydgate's Fall of Princes, published by three English printers.[15] The same theme informed the even more popular Mirror for Magistrates. "Marke not this one, but marke the ende of all" (22: 98),[16] Thomas Sackville wrote in The Mirror. He saw kings of yore as spectacles of civic disaster in an infernal wasteland:

> Loe here. . . Prynces of renowne,
> That whilom sat on top of Fortunes wheele,
> Nowe layed ful lowe, like wretches whurled downe,
> Even with one frowne, that stayed but with a smyle.
> (Induction, 526-529)

Fortune's relentless and unceasing change impressed another of The Mirror's poets:

> We knowe. . . the course of Fortune's wheele,
> How constantly it whyrleth styll about,
> Arrearing nowe, whyle elder headlong reele,
> Nowe al the riders alwaye hange in doubte.
> (23: 22-25)

The Mirror exhibited some of the same characters found in The Tragedy: King Edward IV, King Richard III, Jane Shore, and the Duke of Buckingham. Before the play appeared, then, Englishmen associated these figures with Fortune's Wheel as an explanation of their fate. Further on, in Chapter V, we shall see how The True Tragedy's playwright transformed the Wheel of Fortune into a series of scenes to depict a sequence of rulers at different stages on the "wheel." His sequence includes Richmond, who, although nobody said so, was as qualified as any prince for the ups and downs of historical fate. Yet Richmond -- and by extension, his dynasty -- appear only on the "up-side" in the play.

For now, it is important to notice how Jane Shore's complaint against Fortune in the second scene of The True Tragedy establishes early in the play the idea of climbing and falling princes as replicas of each other, making that notion a governing principle of a drama which exhibits in action both royal and non-royal "ryders of the rollyng wheel" (The Mirror, 12: 1). "O Fortune," begins Edward IV's concubine,

> . . . wherefore wert thou called Fortune?
> . . . . . . . . . . . .
> I as she hath advanced me,
> So may she throw me down.
> (195-205)

Should the king die, she, his mistress, will be impoverished:

> Now is misery at hand,
> Now will my foes tryumph at this my fall,
> Those whom I have done most good,
> Will now forsake me.
>
> (249-251)

With Shore as a "looking glasse" (246), an instructive example of a certain want of wisdom, the behaviour of other characters in the situation she stands for becomes commentary on the nature of royalty as represented by the king figures who dominate the play. Shore's first scene, coupled with circumstances of her second appearance as an outcast beggar during Richard's reign, dramatizes the shifts in loyalty which take place as Fortune's Wheel "turns," bringing up another king to the throne. Three old friends who once obtained favours from her when she was in her "cheefest pomp" and "swayed the swoord" (1085-1088), see her anew as a dishonour to the king, and, a "blot of defame" to all her kin (1019-1035). No one will help her lest they hurt themselves. Morton, once her dearest friend, he says, expresses the psychology of ordinary mortals who scramble for safety as they sense that the "wheel" is about to turn:

> Now sir, who but king Richard beares sway, and hath proclaimed John Earl of Lincolne, heire aparant to the Crown, the Yoong Princes they are in the Tower, nay some saies more, they are murthered. But this makes me to muse, the Duke of Buckingham and the King is at such variance, that did all in all helpe him to the Crowne, but the Duke of Buckingham is rid downe to Breaknock-Castle in Wales, and there he meanes to raise up a power to pull down the usurper, but let them agree as they will, for the next faire winde ile over seas.
>
> (1136-1144)

And overseas is where Richmond lurks, perhaps a better bet than Buckingham.

The tragedy of Shore's wife is not the only expression of the idea of slippery fortune in the destiny of kings and their subjects. For example, Richard addresses Fortune, too, demanding to be made king (443-459). His Page declares to the audience, in language calling to mind the image of Fortune's wheel:

> I see my Lord is fully resolved to climbe, but how
> he climbes ile leave that to your judgements, but
> what his fall will be that's hard to say.
> (475-477)

Eventually, Richard, like Shore, is abandoned by fair-weather friends who change allegiance to Richmond. When word comes that Blunt and Oxford have deserted, Richard complains that a king's own subjects seek the fall of their Prince (1631-1632). More supporters, Talbert, Shrewsbury, the FitzHerberts, and others, join Richmond (1723-1734). There seems to be a stampede in the direction of the new "climber" for the crown when finally men hurrying to Richmond's side, pass the Page. These deserters from Richard's following report still others are on the way. "A Richard," the Page says sadly, "Now do my eyes witness that thy end is at hand (1796).

Thus, The True Tragedy, despite its conformity to the Tudor moral myth, is underlain with the assumptions that fortune continually turns up new kings and brings each to eventual ruin. And much of the play is devoted to what lesser men do as one prince is cast down and other up, according to a theory of history which emphasizes their sameness, not their moral kind.[17]

In the light of The True Tragedy's amoral historical scheme which makes all kings seem alike, we can now look at the "character" of one of The True Tragedy's king figures, as an important lord helps define him. A principal feature of Richard's "personality" is his characterization as an actor, which sets a pattern for his moral associates, the members of his court and retinue. With Richard as an actor, his associates perforce are actors with him.

Their partnership as actors is for Richard and the Duke of Buckingham the basis of political alliance: ". . . by the helpe of thy Lord," Richard tells Buckingham's messenger in the beginning, "I will so plaie my part, / that ile be more than I am. . . ." (414-415). An early scene shows the collaborative nature of their art. Buckingham suffers an imaginary insult in a scuffle of his own improvising. He creates the occasion:

> how now. . . doo you justle in the presence of the King? This is more then needs,
>
> (712-714)

and Richard seizes upon the feigned abuse, inflating the incident into a case of treason. The popular demand that Richard takes the throne is also the product of their collusion. The Lord Mayor and the Aldermen have offered to make Richard king, but, as the page reports,

> he refused so faintly, that if it had bene offered once more, I know he would have taken it, the Duke of Buckingham is gone about it, and is now in the Guild Hall making his Oration.
>
> (913-916)

Richard has got Buckingham to follow up his act of reluctance with a piece of speech-making urging the need to make him king.

Buckingham is only one of the characters who must play roles for this would-be king. Dr. Shaw must deliver a sermon proving the bastardy of the little princes (908-910). The Page must bring in a gang of ruffians on cue, to create a council crisis ridding Richard of Hastings and Standley (934-941). Richard also requires the Archbishop of York's help in persuading the queen to release the prince from sanctuary. And with the Archbishop must be an ambush large enough to make the mission convincing (869-871). Richard needs Catesby, too, to read out a proclamation of a trumped-up case of witchcraft (958-960). In sum, he needs a whole cast of actors, including supernumeraries, to support his show of legitimacy and make himself a king.

But of all the performers who surround the new king, Buckingham is the principal actor, next, of course, to Richard himself. The Duke, too, characterizes himself as an actor, one who knowingly practices deception and uses language for effect. Arrested for treason, he bemoans Richard's ingratitude in an exhibition of his art of oratory which rehearses some of his accomplishments:

> Ah Richard, did I in Guild-Hall pleade the Orator for thee, and help thee in all thy slie and wicked practices, and for my reward doest thou alot me death? Ah Buckingham, thou plaidst thy part and made him king. . . .
> (1353-1356)

Buckingham is also among the many characters who change their allegiance from Richard to Richmond. Before he is led away, Buckingham makes another oration. He may be performing his old act, but for a new king:

> Then know this countrey men, the cause I am arested this, Is for bringing in your lawfull King, which is Henry Earle of Richmond. . . hee is your lawfull King, and this a wrongfull usurper. . . .
> (1367-1373)

At the last moment, Buckingham has changed his moral "character" from Tudor bad to Tudor good. But has he changed his social type at all? He still seems an actor making persuasive orations to legitimize the claims of a would-be king, if only to gain the fame that conquers death.

This moral volte face of a character who has been playing a supporting role for one king, and now, rejected, seeks to serve another with his art, leads an audience acquainted with the repetitions of Fortune's Wheel to suspect that Richmond's character mirrors Richard's. Although he never encounters the Tudor hero in the drama, Buckingham's character as an actor, and his change of mind with fortune suggest that more than superficial likenesses exist between one king and another on the treadmill of English history.

The Duke's change of affections points to explicit parallels between the two royal characters he supports. Each presumes to the crown on flimsy grounds; each is touched with motifs of pretense and disguise. The idea that Buckingham can support one would-be king as well as another encourages the audience to think of Richard and Richmond as versions of each other. Buckingham's transfer of his talents to a new political ally in need of supporters -- and, perhaps, supporting actors -- indicates that the dramatist wanted Richard's character as a leading actor, which he had anatomized in the episodes of Richard's usurpation, to illuminate his successor's much more cryptically dramatized show.

The handling of formal parallelism as a method of characterizing stage kings through their associates in the drama concludes our survey of techniques of portraying royalty as social beings. In this chapter we have confined ourselves to some of the methods of social characterization important to Tudor dramatists of royalty, methods ranging from treatments of speech, decorum, situation, and costume, to the handling of royalty's associates with a formal design. In the next chapter, we shall begin the examination of theatrical imagery for its contributions to the portrayal of royalty on the Tudor stage.

# Chapter V

At this point, we want to see something of the artistry of which Tudor dramatists were capable when they portrayed the nature of royalty through imagery, occasionally using it as Shakespeare did to lift the princely character out of the particularities of his moral and social "personality" to present him as the "type" of human nature, a universal soul. Theatrical imagery, defined as the making of pictures or the imitating of the appearances of things, takes several forms which are singularly appropriate for dramatizing royalty. First, there is the visual imagery of the king play, the subject of this chapter. The changing figures, shapes, and colours that the spectator saw passing before him constitute the drama's visual or scenic imagery. In king plays it surrounded royal personae with the spectacle imitating the magnificence of a real royal estate.

The dramatists of the Fifteenth and Sixteenth centuries also complemented and enriched their royal drama with imagery created in words. Chapter VI treats this form of theatrical imagery in the king play. But other varieties of imagery, the handling of tactile elements in costume, cloth and paint, for example, or the use of instrumental and vocal music, and the metre and patterns of sound in speech,[1] are more or less obscure. No doubt, all forms of imagery worked together to produce a composite impression of the Tudor stage king on his audience. We can deal only with the surviving evidence of the highly complex work of art that a fully mounted drama about kings might actually have been.

The fact remains that no treatment of the Tudor stage king can pretend to be adequate without considering the two primary forms of theatrical imagery, scenic and verbal, about which it is possible to know a good deal. Furthermore, the importance of these kinds of imagery to Tudor dramatists is well established. Glynne Wickham brought scenic imagery to notice in his valuable Early English Stages.[2] Carolyn F. E. Spurgeon's systematic investigation of the poetic imagery of Shakespeare's drama opened to many students the subject of the pictorial language of plays as metaphoric expression.[3]

Our goal of appreciating the complex achievements of Tudor dramatists in designing the theatrical imagery of the king play will involve us in the practice of working with scenic imagery and pictorial language together, a subject undertaken in Chapter VII. A step-by-step approach, however, requires us to begin now with the royal drama's scenic imagery.

The processes of concrete picture-making by which dramatists composed the visible spectacle of royalty in their plays become clear when they are dealt with according to their increasing complexity. Props, paraphernalia, and other moveable or semi-moveable devices surrounding the princely character are the simplest forms of scenic imagery in drama. They are the theatre's representations of distinctive natural objects and common artifacts, recognizable to everyone in the audience. Chapter I acquainted us with some of the objects relevant to royalty in particular: the orb and scepter, for example, and the king's throne and his palace facade. The prop and furniture category of scenic imagery also includes the royal tents, as well as the trees, mountains, ships, and gardens treated fully by Professor Wickham,[4] and the beds, cupboards, horses, castles, and roses, about which Richard Southern has more to say.[5] All of these objects are scenic imagery of the elementary sort, however ornamented or mechanically intricate they may be. We should include costume and colour among them: the king's royal purple robes, his glittering armour, his feathered hat, his wig, and his mask. Of primary importance is the crown, although that royal insignium is discussed more fully in Chapter VII where we can see its treatment in scene and language together.

Simulated objects, and even real ones occasionally brought into the scene, may be invested with symbolic meaning relevant to the king. The meanings that objects may betoken are derived in part from conventions at large, and in part from the specific details of their representation as part of royalty's accessories. It is significant, we know, that Herod is armed with a club, or that Wisdom wears an imperial crown, not a coronet or tiara. A single object could contain the essence of a much larger scenic image involving royalty, so that the cup of wine a Fury carried in a dumbshow for Thomas Hughes's *Misfortunes of Arthur* signifies a particular banquet held by a certain king (I, Dumbshow, 4, 11-12). The human heart, which, as Tudor Englishmen could learn, imparts life and spirit to the whole body,[6] has complex meaning as a concrete image when Cambises holds it aloft in Thomas Preston's play, exclaiming:

> Beholde *Praxaspes* thy Sonnes owne hart,
> O how well the same was hit. . . .
> (*Cambyses King of Persia*, sig. D1$^{r}$)

The emotional value of the heart as object, and its associations with the child Cambises has killed in drunken target practice, fuse memorably to make a specific moral emblem for the repulsive "character" of the king. In fact, a painted version of the emblematic treatment of the heart appeared in the Fifth Act dumbshow of Thomas Hughes's *Misfortunes of Arthur*, where the first "gentleman" carried a "Target. . . with a mans hart sore wounded & the blood gushing out, crowned with a Crowne imperiall. . . " (V, Dumbshow, 6-7).

The special clothes a king figure wears in addition to his royal regalia might have important meaning of their own. Longshanks's glass suit, in Peele's *King Edward the First*, signifies his indulgence of his proud Spanish queen. Moreover, the symbolic apparel of the king's associates can also tell something about the nature of royalty. An example is the King of the World, one of a trio of moral associates of Emperor Tiberius and King Herod in *Mary Magdalene*. This abstract figure of royalty must have been a wondrous spectacle, a walking table of astrological correspondences, rendering him the visible image of the nasty type of necromancer. Here he is, enumerating his personal adornments of cosmic significance in a speech useful to us because the verbal imagery elucidates the scenic:

> gold perteynyng to þe sonne, as astronomer nevyn;
> sylvyr, to þe mone whyte and pure;
> Iryn, on-to þe maris þat long may endure;
> þe fegetyff mercury, on-to mercuryus;
> copyr, on-to venus red In his merrour;
> the frangabyll tyn, to Jubyter, yf ȝe can dyscus;
> On þis planyt saturne, full of rancur,
> þis soft metell led, nat of so gret puernesse:
> Lo, all þis rych tresor with þe wor[l]d doth indure
> the vij prynsys of hell gret bowntosnesse.
>
> (I, 7, 315-324)

Behind him come the King of Flesh, garnished with flowers and spices, and Prince Satan attired in his tower, symbol of his assaults on the soul of man. The value which this visible symbolism in costumes and accoutrements has for dramatizing royalty is that it provides details about the kinds of evil Tiberius' and Herod's clan encompasses. The audience knows more about an emperor and a king in the drama from looking at these subordinate figures.

In a way hard for us to imagine now, the horse was the image of power, wealth, and pleasure which delineated the nature of royalty in the eyes of the Tudor audience. Erasmus, as adviser to the would-be Christian Prince, quotes Deuteronomy to express his disapproval of a great display of royal steeds: a king "shall not multiply horses unto himself."[7] Whether Herod prances into the playing place (Ludus Coventriae, 18: 2, 10, 17), or pursues the Holy Family at full gallop (Coventry Shearmen and Taylors' pageant, 894-895), the spectacle of his horse signifies a ruthless indifference to lesser souls under the trampling hooves. The dramatist wanted Herod's equestrian style to be kept distinct from the stately progress of the Magi (Ludus Coventriae, 18: 22), and his horse is in broad contrast to the humble borrowed donkeys ridden by Mary and Jesus. (Ludus Coventriae, 20: 84; 26c: 195, 221). We shall be noticing more of the importance of the king's horses in Chapter VI.

The horse as a symbolic image affecting the representation of royalty brings us to our second category of scenic images: the movements, postures, and gestures of the individual characters, the dramatic activity usually called mime, in which the king took part. Riding, praying, begging, washing, undressing, dying, the actors portraying the king and his associated personae were perpetually creating distinctive images for the eyes, images that defined royalty. The player's gestures -- the lift of a finger or the tilt of his head -- and his facial expressions, as he rolled his eyeballs or grimaced, were pictorial imitations of humanity in the life.

Mimed images, too, could have symbolic import reflecting on the king. The stage sleep, signified by a reclining figure, was the occasion for transformation, heavenly visions, spiritual insensitivity, enchantment, bewitched reason, surprise, and deceit, from the slumber of the Magi, to whom a warning angel appears (Coventry Shearmen and Taylors' pageant, 724-732), to the trances of the lovers and the Fairie Queen in A Midsummer Night's Dream. The act of drinking, which could variously connote conviviality, immoderation, or fatigue, according to the dramatist's intent, brought together the spectacle of the cup and the spectacle of the drinker to compose a transitory picture symbolizing a basic human act of moral or social meaning. As an actor portrayed a princely character drinking in a certain way, royalty was defined by the spectacle he made.

Our third category of scenic imagery involving king figures entails picture-making on a much larger scale than mime. It is the imagery of the royal tableau, composed of several figures, props, and the painted scenery. The king-in-state belongs to the tableau class of scenic imagery, as does the royal council scene, and the king's court of justice. Other tableaux in which royalty could figure were the coronation, the deposition, the wedding, the funeral, and the sacrifice. Tableau is the basis of traditional royal pageantry and formal display.[8] In drama, the royal tableaux were more than conventional. Dramatists used certain tableaux repeatedly, not only because of their proven effectiveness as spectacle, but because the formal group picture imitated the conventions of royal shows in public life. Tudor drama, from Ludus Coventriae to Shakespeare's histories and early comedies, furnishes plenty of evidence that the tableau images, as an organizing device, could be an important consideration in designing the dramaturgy of a play about a king. Further on, we shall come to some examples of dramatic structure based on tableau.

For Tudor audiences, the tableau image of the king acquired certain of its symbolic values from the way in which it figured royalty's relationships to others in the spatial arrangements of the group. In Chapter I, we noticed George Peele's stage arrangements for King Edward the First, with the king in the centre, elevated on his throne, and the Queen Mother and the royal consort disposed at either hand. Peele deployed nobles, attendants, and soldiers about royal figures according to their rank and function. Other royal tableaux depicting formal occasions also arranged the characters in symmetrical, hierarchical, or processional compositions expressing social orders of precedence and rank, and the supremacy of royal power. An example already familiar is Ludus Coventriae's arrangement of figures at Herod's scaffold during the trial of Jesus, where figures not making obeisance to the king are specified in the stage directions (30: 366).

Two tableau compositions useful for portraying royalty were favourites of Tudor dramatists, partly because of their intrinsic theatricality, and partly because they were easily infused with symbolic meaning and embellished with ornamental decor becoming to the prince. One of these especially fascinating tableaux is the banquet, already mentioned in Chapter I, and to which we shall come again later. The other is the bed scene.

To appreciate the versatility of the bed scene as a device for dramatizing royalty we can glance again at The True Tragedy of Richard the Third, which begins with a tableau of the king-in-state. But there, the dying Edward IV lies in his royal bed, evidently carried on stage by his nobles. The king is depicted as the agent of public harmony, the central figure in a symmetrical scene of social order. He visibly knits a public amity. Yet, with the royal pageant of reconciliation conducted as a bed scene, the idea of the king's infirmity permeates the tableau. Edward is not simply a man reaching the end of his life. The only way the audience ever sees him in this play is in a bedridden condition. The dominant impression of this royal tableau, compounded of king-in-state and king-in-bed, is of the king's feebleness, a feebleness that the dramatist elaborates by other scenic imagery as The True Tragedy proceeds.

Although a royal tableau could, in a general way, establish the framework for the drama of kings, or set the atmosphere for what ensued, royal personae were caught up in scenic imagery of still another kind: the moving, changing configurations of action among the characters involved in the scenes. The fluid arrangements of personae in combinations of mimed actions made the king and his associates come alive. The imagery of group action in which the king participates was distinct from the nearly static picture-making of royal pageantry and formal show, a contrast useful to the dramatist, as we shall see. Dynamic pictures of human beings interacting with the king evolved, dissolved, and reassembled in new formations as the dramatic narrative unwound.

Group actions imitated royalty's common encounters and the events of the king's social life. The kiss, the quarrel, acts of obeisance and consolidation, an execution, or an escape, all are impressive images of social activity known to the spectator, and in which the dramatist could involve the king. Even King Assuerus and Queen Hester could enjoy an embrace of sorts, as we learned in Chapter I. (Godly Queen Hester, 875). The moving images of group action around the king also took conventional forms, however. Through their various "dressings," in costume, props, and decorum, we recognize similar configurations of human situations repeated in different contexts. The clash of opposing wills, for one, is equally evident, whether royalty is found in a debate, a duel, or a battle, and the massing of human force around a victim is visible in a robbery, a torture, or a siege. Therefore, in playing off group action against a royal tableau, a technique to be illustrated later in this chapter, the dramatist was often juxtaposing two categories of stage conventions.

The stream of stage activity among their king figures and other characters is witness to the inventive genius of the dramatists, the range of their imaginations, and the scope of their familiarity with literary convention. Some dramatists transformed conventional scenic configurations involving princely characters by dramatizing them in new contexts, or by re-emphasizing the royal relationships usually described. The configuration underlying the psychomachy, a venerable Christian tradition dramatizing the will of mankind divided between good and evil forces, could be represented anew as a king's vacillation between two contrary choices, each equally unpleasant. That seems to be the motive underlying Christopher Marlowe's treatment, in Edward the Second, of the king who cannot make up his mind to depose himself. Edward's speeches reflect for us the gestures of his hesitations as he gives in to his lords. His contradictory attitudes, conducted within a group configuration, are visible to the spectators of the play, who follow the movements of the central symbolic object, the crown. Here, Edward seems to hand the men his crown, only to clutch it back and put it on his head:

> Here, take my crowne, the life of Edward too,
> Two kings in England cannot raigne at once:
> But stay a while, let me be king till night,
> That I may gaze upon this glittering crown. . . .
> . . . . . . . . . . . .
> Why gape you for your soveraignes overthrow?
> My diadem I meane, and guiltlesse life,
> See monsters see, ile weare my crowne againe.
> . . . . . . . . . . .
> . . . comfort finde I none,
> But that I feele the crowne upon my head,
> And therefore let me weare it yet a while.
> (2168-2194)

Weakening again, Edward gives up the crown at last, but not without a final gesture that rationalizes his defeat:

> . . . heavens & earth conspire
> To make me miserable: here receive my crowne,
> Receive it? no, these innocent hands of mine
> Shall not be guiltie of so foule a crime,
> He of you all that most desires my bloud,
> And will be called the murtherer of a king,
> Take it. . . .
> (2211-2217)

Still other playwrights could represent moral indecision as a struggle between groups for the control of a single character. That configuration contributes to the action of plays as diverse as Mundus and Infans and

Bale's King Johan.

Obviously, the dramatist could give his lively flow of royal doings symbolic meaning, as we can detect in Marlowe's treatment of Edward. Not the least of his techniques for heightening the significance of an imaged action was the moral and social characterization he allotted his kings, and the part he then assigned them in the actions of the group. It makes a visibly significant difference whether a king figure appears in the middle in a struggle for control, as is the case with Marlowe's Edward, and with the King of Marcylle in Mary Magdalene, or whether he was one of the characters seeking control of others, frequently Herod's function.

We shall be seeing more of these basic techniques of representing royalty through scenic imagery in the next chapters, where some of the same symbols and devices will come to notice for their adaptability to expression in language. Now, however, we can examine the dramatization of royalty through more complicated ways of using scenic imagery, three special treatments of scenic picture-making found in Tudor dramatic art.

The first of these treatments of scenic imagery with a special bearing on figures of royalty is a device already discussed from another point of view in Chapter IV: the allusion. The practice of alluding to superhuman, mythological, and historical figures is common in Sixteenth Century literature and drama, and we have seen in Gorboduc how Norton and Sackville employed allusions to Brutus to make an important point about the king. We have also noticed the author of The True Tragedy of Richard the Third alluding to a living personage, Queen Elizabeth, in the concluding royal pageant of the play. But the practice of visually representing a figure of allusion, in the shape of a persona, is a phenomenon peculiar to the Tudor drama. The visible image of a figure of allusion is one of the most useful devices employed by the dramatists in representing the nature of royalty.

It is not always easy to decide whether an anomalous character in a Tudor king play is a regular participant in the immediate business of the king or whether he is simply meant as an allusion, that is, a reference with which to compare royalty. Some playwrights made their intentions about such figures quite clear. When Thomas Preston brings Venus and Cupid on stage in Cambyses King of Persia, he is using them for their symbolic value as allusions. The "eyeless boy" shoots the king in a visible enactment of the classic metaphor for falling in love (sig. E3 $^r$). These two pagan deities further contribute specific moral content to the kind of passion that smites the king: Cambises indulges in no respectable Christian sort of love. But beyond these functions, Venus and Cupid have nothing else to do. Similarly, Ludus Coventriae's procession of Biblical kings, abstracted like ghosts from their proper times and places to vouch for Jesus' royal and celestial origins (7), are little more than minor figures of allusion, however useful, who are not actually caught up in the drama.

More nebulous are George Peele's uses of figures of allusion as scenic imagery in his king plays. One of his devices in King Edward the First is the allusion to Robin Hood already noticed. A prince and his followers dress in green, and imitate the fabulous outlaw band (1370). Peele's strange combination of disguise and allusion, as he has worked it into the action of his play, leaves his intentions obscure, for the most part. In King Johan, John Bale further confuses the problem of visual allusions by entangling in the plot a set of vices, personfications of abstract ideas, later transforming them into the personages who historically were enemies of his king.

A royal figure of allusion of quite another sort is the one the Spanish ambassador reported he saw in "a gallant and notable interpretation of a chapter of the Apocalypse," played on St. John's eve in 1535. The figure of allusion was the image of Henry VIII, a character so far embroiled in the street show's action as to have been the hero, "cutting off the heads of the clergy." The real king enjoyed the performance of his likeness from an upstairs window, where he could "laugh at his ease, and encourage the people" by revealing himself as the original of the allusion below.[9]

A second special treatment of visual imagery to which Tudor dramatists were partial for dramatizing kings was the emblematic scene. Tableaux, mimed action, symbolic props, and sometimes figures of allusion, combined to make an image with a motto or a moral lesson relevant to the royal personae. When, in the second act dumbshow of Gorboduc, a king figure drank from a gold cup and fell down dead, the spectators learned that he had foolishly drunk the poison that "betokeneth flattery" (II, Dumbshow, 17). Messages as bald as that one can be gleaned from the imagery of Erasmus and the Bible. Many emblematic objects, figures and sentiments found in dumbshows and other stage scenes had wide circulation through the media of sermons and emblem books.[10] It is reasonable to suppose that spectators usually understood what they saw enacted, obscure as Gorboduc's emblem may seem today. But the dramatists in Tudor times also felt free to make up their own emblematic mottos;[11] consequently their art is spiced with private enigmas we cannot savour.

Sometimes dramatists chose to handle a passage of a play proper as if it were an emblematic image for the king. King Cambises's gesture with the heart of the child he has killed delivers a message in the emblematic style. But often the emblematic image became a separate unit of the play, a dumbshow, and served an important structural function in the design of the king play. As a dumbshow introducing an act of a play, the device of emblematic imagery could rehearse visibly, in metaphor and symbol, the argument of royalty's actions to come. In that wise, the fifth act dumbshow of Gascoigne's and Kinwelmershe's Jocasta projects a lesson about ambitious princes to be drawn from the dramatization that ensues. A double-faced figure of a woman appears, sitting in a chariot with her lap full of jewels, and pulled about by a pair of crowned kings and a pair of slaves:

> . . . changing the kings unto the left hand & the slaves unto the right hand, taking the crownes from the kings heads she crowned therwith the ij. slaves, & casting the vyle clothes of the slaves upon the kings, she despoyled the kings of their robes, and therwith apparelled the slaves.
>
> (V, Dumbshow, 10-15)

As a visible metaphor containing the essence of the concluding act of Jocasta, the show images "a plaine Type or figure of unstable fortune" (17) reversing the conditions of her kingly vassals.

A third way of handling scenic imagery special to Tudor drama about royalty was in patterns of repetition and contrast. This is another facet of the same technique we have seen before at work on other kinds of dramatic elements in the king play. But the dramatization of royalty through formal design of scenic imagery calls for identical and contrasting images, as well as parallel arrangements of scenic devices, inviting comparisons of a king's situation. With this kind of formal organization of scenic imagery at their command, Tudor dramatists could devise portraits of royalty that went far beyond the construction of "character" in the moral and social sense.

A simple example will clarify the principles of scenic patterning in king plays before we take up the more complicated treatments to occupy us during the rest of this chapter. Two separate spectacles of bow-and-arrow shooting occur in Preston's *Cambyses King of Persia.* The first of these archery episodes is the king's murder of Praxaspes' son during a drunken show of skill and determination (sig. D1$^{r}$) The other episode is Cupid's scene, in which the king succumbs to a wicked infatuation (sig. E3$^{r}$). The two episodes, in their identical displays of props and actions -- bows, arrows, and the postures of shooting -- seem to say that the king's passions, whether he is drunk or in love, are equally vicious and equally merely a sporting matter. But the reversals within the two images, with the king as archer in one, and the king as target in the next, chart in visible metaphors the deterioration of his will, and his loss of control over his affairs.

Fortunately, not all formal design in the scenic imagery with which Tudor dramatists handled their king figures is as obtrusively obvious as Preston's. The distinctive portrait of royalty composed by the author of *The True Tragedy of Richard the Third* arises from a somewhat subtler style of handling action, although it never attains the complex richness of that in Shakespeare's Richard III.[12] Early in the play there is a scene in which the young King Edward V is forgotten by the nobles of his council (490-540). Absorbed in their political maneuvers, the king's advisers abandon the pretence of giving the king advice. They drift downstage to discuss affairs of state in a private huddle of their own. The dialogue helps us picture their confidential attitudes in a reconfiguration of the action within a king-in-council tableau.

> Gray. We have not the Prince in charge, therefore we neede not care.
>
> Rivers. We have the Prince, but they the authoritie.
> (512-514)

The boy king recalls his men to themselves with a valiant statement of princely resolution. Rivers having been dispatched on his way, Gray and Vaughan scurry back to reassure the king of his sovereignty, solemnly recomposing the picture of the king in his state:

> Gray. Worthily well spoken of your princely Majestie, which no doubt sheweth a king-like resolution.
>
> Vaughan. A toward yoong Prince, and no doubt forward to all vertue, whose raigne God long prosper among us.
> (534-537)

The spectator, watching only the configurations and the gestures of the characters, did not need to hear all the words. He could see the dissolution of the formal composition around the king, notice the conspiratorial gestures of the nobles, and the departure of one of them; and then observe the others reassemble with sheepish haste the picture of the king-in-council.

Almost exactly the same shifts in the configuration of scenic imagery occur about another king later on in the same play. This time

Richard is the principal. A messenger enters (1599) and the king's council, hungry for news, desert the king to surround the newcomer with questions. Again, dialogue recovers scenic imagery for the reader which the spectator could see for himself:

> Lovell. Sirrha is the marriage concluded betweene the Scottish Earle and the faire Lady Rosa?
>
> Catesby. Prethie tell us, is it concluded?
> (1606-1608)

Even Richard's servant chimes in: "How saies thou, is it concluded?" (1609). The visible lapse from decorum, the disintegration of the tableau of king-in-council irritates Richard. He tries to pull the scene together himself:

> Nay will you give me leave to tell you that? Why you villaines will you know the secrets of my letter by interrupting messengers that are sent to me?
> (1610-1612)

The parallels in visual imagery between this scene and little Edward's, as the royal tableau dissolves into a particular configuration of action, and then re-forms, are what is remarkable here. The similarities mark Richard's progress along the same course Edward followed before him. Richard is now visibly as weak as the boy king was when his advisers went about their plans without consulting him.

This is not all that The True Tragedy has to offer in parallel treatment of the king through scenic imagery. The two formal tableaux of king-in-council, with the breakdowns described above, should be placed in the context of the major royal tableaux that open and close the play. The True Tragedy begins, as we know, with old King Edward IV in formal state, visibly composing a display of public harmony. The play ends in much the same way, with the triumphant coronation pageant, the crowning of Richmond as King Henry VII, which is another tableau of the king-in-state. Again, there are visible expressions of a newly-knit accord. Among the similarities between the first and last formal tableau is the presence of the same two women in each: Edward IV's Queen Elizabeth and her daughter, who in Richmond's tableau become the Queen Mother and the Queen-to-be. These two females serve as visible links, important ones, between the beginning and the end of the play, one of them delivering the panegyric in Queen Elizabeth I's honour. Despite their visible parallels, and the identity of some of their personae, there are significant differences between these two balanced scenes of royalty that open and close the play. For example, the atmosphere of the death bed affects Edward IV's pageant. The obstinacy of his nobles, Lord Marcus and Lord Hastings, who cross the king with a surly exchange of words (121-129) before they finally kneel, beg pardon, and shake hands, further mars the harmony of the realm. Nothing comparable happens in Henry VII's royal tableau at the drama's conclusion.

Between the terminal tableaux of the king-in-state come the two council scenes mentioned before, those making Edward V and Richard III alike by visibly reducing their power over their vassals. The sequence of king-in-state and king-in-council tableaux focuses on four successive kings. Each royal tableau depicts the realm in formal order or proceeding about business according to convention. The first three tableaux -- Edward IV's, Edward V's, and Richard III's -- break down visibly, in terms of scenic imagery, and are marred by evidence of the king's weakness. Improvisation pulls the formal order together again around the king, as if the participants suddenly remembered their cues.

But Richmond's royal pageant at the end is perfect. It proceeds without a hitch. In fact, it seems to be prolonged interminably, as several speakers step forward to sing out the Tudor generations. All that spoils this last royal pageant is our certainty that, sooner or later, it, too, will break down like the others. Because the two "inner" tableaux of royalty are so neatly paralleled, we expect the outer ones to be parallel as well. Because of the similarities of the first three royal tableaux, we expect that the last will sooner or later conform to pattern, the pattern of the Falls of Princes from Fortune's Wheel. Through his craftsmanship in designing scenic imagery as repetitions of action patterns within the royal tableau form, the dramatist has cunningly guided our attitude toward formal royal shows. He has made sceptics of the spectators. We see formal royal tableaux -- after three examples -- as performances of personae obliged to keep up the appearance of the king. When Henry VII and his retinue maintain their pageant poses as if they were charmed statuary, we can only blink in disbelief. The new king and his supporting cast must simply be much more convincing actors. than those who have gone before.

In a wholly different style, Ludus Coventriae's two King Herods are implicated in scenic designs that work on a grand scale to draw together widely separated elements of the huge cycle. We have already seen how the formal organization and characterization techniques establish a hierarchical family of wicked dandies in Ludus Coventriae, and we know where the wicked kings belong in the scheme. Those same associations place the second King Herod in the design of sharply conceived tableau scenes comprising the Passion Play episodes (26-31) which exploit the antitheses between the strutting, richly dressed, and sumptuously furnished groups of characters forming the conspiracy, and the simply clothed, and sometimes barefoot (26c: 285-286) citizens and apostles who cluster about Jesus wherever he goes. For a while, alternating tableaux shift the audience's attention back and forth between the splendiferous Jews reclining on cushions in the council-house, and the apostles assembling in the home of the water-bearer, Simon Leper. The tableaux are joined and embellished by transits of the playing place, arrivals and departures of messengers, and so on. This movement climaxes in an outburst of noise, lights, and confusion for the arrest of Jesus from one scaffold to another for trials before his grandiose enemies. One of the villains of lesser degree whom Jesus confronts in Ludus Coventriae is the cycle's second King Herod.

The handling of the dramaturgy in the Passion Plays of Ludus Coventriae is powerful, impressive enough as a way of treating an important segment of the cycle, and defining royalty's place in it. But the first Herod's banquet (20), for which Ludus Coventriae is justly renowned, is a crucial scenic device for the whole drama. The royal banquet not only provides coherence for the Nativity episodes, but it also binds more closely the widely separated events of the Nativity and the Passion. The scene of feasting by the king and his accomplices accomplishes these unifying purposes by functioning as the cycle's node of patterns, gathering together repeated themes, contrasts, and reversals in scenic imagery of various kinds. To understand what this scene does to Herod, as a figure of royalty, we shall have to examine his banquet with care, remembering that the audience could see every gesture, every action, and every object that we extrapolate through the dialogue.

Already a grandly costumed dandy, the Nativity Herod emerges during his banquet as a full-blown royal magnifico. A lavish host, he is a spendthrift for good wines and food; he commands a handsome decor and service. He orders his knights to furnish the table just so:

> Coverid with a coryous cloth and with rych wurthy fare
> Servyse ffor þe lovelyest lorde þat levynge is on grownde
> Beste metys and wurthyest wynes loke þat ȝe non spare
> þow þat a lytyl pynt xulde cost a Mł pownde.
> (20: 145-148)

Soon the steward announces that the feast the knights have assembled is ready; he brings water for washing, and orders the minstrels to play as the meal comes in. The king seats himself, and bids his knights join him. The act of hospitality makes him feel expansive and jolly. We can envision his gestures and attitudes through his speeches:

> Com forth knyghtys sytt down and ete
> And be as mery as ȝe kan be
> (20: 156-157)

> Merthis þerfore make ȝe and be ryght no thynge sadde
> Spare nother mete nor drynke and spare for no dyrthe
> of wyne nor of brede. . . .
> (20: 213-215)

The scene is much prolonged with repetitious dialogue and action. The king urges his guests to eat and drink more, and calls for another "mery fytt" from his minstrels (20: 153, 231-232). But the gluttony and merriment are interrupted by a speech from an uninvited guest: the spectral Mors, the assassin sent by God to avenge the children's slaughter. After his first speech Mors is silently present during the rest of the scene, during the bragging, the further feasting, and the mirthful stories of the gesturing knights who recount their murderous doings, at the king's request. This fascinating but disgusting scene is actually a pleasurable experience for the spectators who watch the doom of the king and his minions approaching slowly and inevitably. Finally, at the height of merriment, Mors kills Herod and his knights. A devil packs the king's body away. Herod is now "wormys mete," a satisfaction for the audience, whether or not they heard a word of the dialogue, or of Mors's long sermon at the end.

The scenic imagery of the banquet, conducted in this manner, has several points to notice that have to do with the design of the drama. One is the king's banquet's function as a brutal sequel to the orgy of blood just enacted, the Massacre of Innocents, which was executed by the knights, victuallers for the king's feast, and now the king's guests. Indeed, the banquet celebrates the Massacre. And the Massacre is a prefiguration of the Crucifixion.

In some cycles (Herod's Killing of the Children, 3, 297-350; Coventry Shearmen and Taylors pageant, 862-865), the Massacre is handled as a grim farce with the women cursing the soldiers, and fighting them with pot ladles. But in Ludus Coventriae, on the contrary, the episode is performed wordlessly. It is a dumbshow (20: 88), concluded by the lamentations of bereft mothers whose postures of grief may not be mistaken. This kind of staging enormously heightens the Massacre's emotional impact. The mimed slaughter and the women's laments make revolting in the extreme the subsequent feasting and drinking in the king's palace by the butchers of the babies. The actions of handwashing, and the mirthful retailing of details of the slaughter, with the violent gesticulations demanded by the dialogue, contribute further to the horror. The banquet scene reeks of Seneca, Thyestes in particular. One could not blame a spectator for thinking of King Herod and his men as cannibals, for that is what the scenic treatment of the two episodes together imprints in the imagination.

In addition to suggesting scenically certain unstated corollaries of the Massacre, the king's banquet is an inverted mirror image of the Last Supper (27), an event far ahead in the drama, and the only other banquet in the cycle. Repeated details of the two tableau scenes, the royal banquet and the Eucharist, urge that the dramatists intended an important connection between the one spectacular meal and the other. There are, of course, the dominant visual contrasts of splendour and simplicity, effected primarily through costume and props, contrasts which are reinforced in the Passion Play episodes by the scheme of tableaux described above, and in which the second King Herod is virtually a reincarnation of the first.

There are also many small symbolic actions within the royal banquet and Last Supper tableaux that require comparison. For example, King Herod washes his hands in water brought by a servant (20: 152). Jesus washes his disciples' feet (27: 848). Antitheses involving doctrine are not within our competence, but we can notice that the emotional impact of Herod's banquet is heightened by the preceding vignette of the lamenting mothers, drowned out by minstrelsy, while in the Last Supper tableau, the woeful figure of Mary Magdalene provides a comparable element (27: 462-474). Each banquet scene also has its image of the sinister, a lurking character who is to bring the host to his death, as the audience well knows. In the king's case it is Mors; in Jesus's, it is Judas. But the kind of suspenseful satisfaction that these two ominous figures furnish in their respective scenes is seated in paradoxical emotions. One, Mors, is God's agent of revenge, while Judas is the agent of salvation. To the inversions of the Last Supper that Herod's royal banquet represents, we must also add the reversed orders of the double tableaux in each instance: Massacre, followed by royal banquet, is the diabolic prefiguration of Last Supper, followed by Crucifixion.

The artistry at work in the horrific scenic imagery of Ludus Coventriae, of which we have now seen a little, does two things to the image of royalty. First, it makes a monster of the Nativity Herod. Secondly, through the formal parallels and antitheses of the Massacre and the banquet with events of Jesus' Passion, scenic imagery extends the first Herod's unspeakable inhumanity to his likeness in a later episode. It is perfectly clear now why the cycle's dramatists have made their second Herod retire for a rest, expressly out of consideration for his appetite (29: 67-68). In the case of either king, then, royalty is portrayed as demonic by nature, outside the bounds of human feeling. The semblance of human form, of "personality," of moral character, and of a kingly rank, is, in Ludus Coventriae's two Herods, but disguises for the protean Satan in one of his many shapes.

Happily, George Peele's style of portraying royalty through the design of scenic imagery delights at least as much as it instructs. On the surface, his Arraignment of Paris (1584), produced at court by the Children of Her Majesty's Chapel, seems merely a costly confection of poetry, song, dance, and charming spectacle culminating in an elaborate compliment to Queen Elizabeth. But Peele's formal patterns of scenic imagery integrate pageantry, props, and a royal figure of allusion with the dramatic framework, besides making them the ornaments of his play.

The Arraignment begins ominously, with "condemned foule Ate" rising from hell with the apple that caused the tragedy of Troy (1-30). Ate, the Fury, sets off the ancient quarrel among Juno, Pallas, and Venus as to which of them, as fairest, should possess the prize. In The Arraignment, however, the apple is a perfect golden ball which Peele makes the central symbolic object in a sequence of four court-of-judgment tableaux, the last of them combined with a tableau of royalty-in-state.

First, the Goddesses appoint the Trojan prince, Paris, represented as a humble shepherd, to be their judge. The decision by a fallible mortal to award the ball to Venus is disastrous. Juno is not satisfied. Visible signs of confusion occur: there are sad lovers, dying lovers, and a lover's funeral to picture the disorder reigning in the celestial realm. Venus, as possessor of the coveted prize, now presumes to sit in judgment on false lovers, dispensing cruel punishments in the form of wicked spells (782-787). As the Olympians assemble around the chief god, Jupiter, hoping to end the strife, the play's third tableau of the court of judgment forms. Before this higher court, Paris must answer for his wrong. His golden oratory wins him acquittal, and he goes to meet his destiny in Troy. But the quarrel continues among the heavenly dames. Finally, to elude blame and trouble, the Olympians appoint Diana to settle the dispute.

With Diana in command of the golden ball controversy, stately images of elegant precision, all typical of royal pageantry, proceed to the play's conclusion. The Olympian court of judgment gives way to a fourth court of judgement tableau, one of yet higher authority. A formal orderliness now prevails. One by one, the contending goddesses pledge, by their symbolic attributes and qualities, to abide by Diana's decision. In formal speeches, all resign their claims to the prize.

This done, Queen Elizabeth takes her place in her state beside the play (1306).[13] Three brightly gowned Fates, fabled abstractions who determined the end of ancient Troy (21-30), sing to her in Latin their repeated phrases of oblation. In another one-by-one formation, the Fates lay their symbolic properties at the feet of the Queen (1314), visibly granting her control over the life of England, a "second Troy." Only then, with images of supernatural power gathered at the throne, does Diana deliver the golden ball into the "Queenes owne hands." (1344). The fairest, the proper winner of the prize, is the nymph Eliza, "In whom do meete so manie giftes in one" (1263). One by one again, the goddesses come forward to make obeisance. Elizabeth accumulates their heavenly virtues, majesty, wisdom, beauty -- not to mention chastity, from her alter ego, Diana -- until she is the peerless sum of all.[14]

Thus, with a splendid gift to royalty, offered in formal pageant show, Peele causes a figure of allusion to enter the play in person to become an important element of his drama. The golden ball, which began as an apple on Proserpina's underworld tree (18), has passed upward from hand to hand, through repeated court-of-justice tableaux that failed to end confusion. Now it belongs to a supreme deity presiding over the highest court. The tableau of the queen in state on the borders of the drama becomes the encompassing framework for the whole show, composing the appearance of perfect harmony at the end. Royalty is the principal performer in Peele's Arraignment, resolving the plot and the patterns of scenic imagery as a visible symbol of ultimate celestial order, a single figure subsuming all heavenly triplicities in an image of the divine.

The spectacle of the living monarch as performer in a drama concludes the description of scenic imagery as a technique of portraying royalty in Tudor dramatic art. The next chapter treats the handling of imagery in the speeches of royal figures, after which, Chapter VII will show how the dramatists composed portraits of royalty by mingling these two kinds of theatrical imagery.

# Chapter VI

Now that we have an idea of what Tudor playwrights could do to dramatize the king figure by composing the scenic imagery of royal magnificence and kingly actions, we are ready to consider some of their achievements in portraying royalty through another kind of pictorial representation in the composition of royal speeches. Again defining theatrical imagery, as in Chapter V, as the making of pictures or the imitation of the appearances of things, we may observe two ways among many in which the dramatic poets employed language to dramatize the nature of royal personae: one, by capturing in the play's dialogue the speech appropriate to king figures, and another, by depicting those many affairs of royalty which do not always lend themselves to scenic representation.

The artistry with which dramatic poets employed language to elaborate their kingly personae ranged from the most sparse and discriminating evocations of the appearances of things belonging to royalty to the unparalleled richness of the poetic imagery with which Shakespeare surrounds his king figures, and which some critics regard as the structural basis of his plays.[1] Provided he had sufficient powers for the purpose and provided the circumstances of theatrical production favoured him, the dramatist, as poet, could do even more with words than with scene to project his vision of the nature of royalty and to depict the consequences of princely deeds and thoughts. He could modulate and refine the impression of the king with much abstract knowledge and fugitive inference. In the case of Shakespeare, the complete portrait of a king figure is so complex as to seem apprehensible only through intuitive responses, and is beyond all but fragmentary analysis.

Language could also reproduce in the mind of the audience the artist's own equivocal attitude toward the royal persona, a "middle state of mind" which Samuel Taylor Coleridge described as "hovering between images."[2] This "hovering" is a mental feeling akin to the suspension of moral judgment mentioned in Chapter III, but its origins, being more obscure, are more elusive, and because elusive, also mysterious and powerful. Shakespeare's portraits of royalty are conducive to the "middle state of mind" because of the multitude of contradictory and modifying impressions arising from the rush of poetic language around his kings. Fleeting and ephemeral as words are, they create their effects with exceeding rapidity, surpassing the capacity of the scene by itself to impress the mind with suggestion and possibility bearing on the figure of the king.

Since Coleridge's time, the literature on Shakespeare's imagery has proliferated, and because princely characters dominate so many of Shakespeare's plays, much of the commentary is relevant to the language of other Tudor playwrights' royal portraits. The value of this scholarly work for the study of the king figure on the Tudor stage may not be gainsaid. The expanding labyrinths of meaning around the king figure that are the wonder of Shakespeare's plays are more or less characteristic of other king plays of the Tudor period.

While taking due notice of the work already done on the language of Shakespearean royal drama, we shall be stressing several techniques, not heretofore much noticed, which are especially appropriate for dramatizing kings. In addition, we shall examine certain metaphoric traditions which had particular relevance to kingly personae, singling out for special attention one cluster of images among many -- light imagery, and, more specifically, the image of the sun -- through which the Tudor playwrights brought royalty's special nature into focus, and refined their portraits of princes.

An examination of standard procedures of Tudor playwrights in dramatizing kings through the language of the speakers perhaps may even clarify some of Shakespeare's intentions which are obscured by his profuse poetic imagery. What other Tudor dramatic poets did more restrainedly in their speeches for royalty may indicate some structural features of Shakespeare's treatment of his kings. The common conventions of dealing with royalty in language may, in fact, be part of the given data, the "notional patterns," as A. P. Rossiter has called them,[3] which dramatic poets could make the subject of king plays, as well as the part of the technique of composing them. Further on, in Chapters VII and VIII, are examples of this attitude toward the language of royalty.

Moreover, our objective of studying the common practices of Tudor dramatists in representing royalty through language will allow us to examine in Chapter VII the close relationship between scenic representation and words in some Tudor king plays, a purpose projected in Chapter V. That done, we can appreciate more fully the contribution of theatrical imagery to the portrayal of royalty on the Tudor stage, a point from which we can come to some conclusions about the Actor King as a major theme of Tudor royal drama.

In order to approach these several goals, we must now describe and illustrate two ways of handling language which dramatize the kingly personae in Tudor plays, each of which brings the stage king into focus as the central figure of his drama, defining his authority, and the extent of his powers over others, and delineating particulars of his personality. The first of these devices is the metaphoric heightening of the language used by king figures, by the characters who talk about them, and by the characters associated with them through the formal patterns of the drama.

By "heightened" use of language, I mean here the intensification of the meaning of royalty's words through metaphoric images, the other means besides visible display and action through which rulers asserted their sovereignty and proclaimed the nature of their authority over other mortals. What the king says is important, and imagery of certain kinds conveyed that royal importance. But the style in which the king uttered his impressive statements is significant, too. The dramatic poet, fashioning speeches for special royal occasions, enhances with imagery the literal meaning of what royalty says, first, because imagery is appropriately ornamental for the kingly rank, and secondly, because metaphors may concentrate the meaning of royalty's complex affairs. By giving a king figure an image-laden speech, the dramatist could express his princely persona's royal rank, and he could also, by judicious composition of his images, further elevate his king, lower him in esteem, or make him otherwise distinctive in his role.

The means of heightening the language of kings through imagery is infinitely variable, and the variety of images with traditional metaphoric significance upon which Tudor dramatic poets could draw for royal speeches is almost endless. But one of the most frequent images which elevates the speeches of princes, and designates their high degree is the image of the sun. A speech of King Richard in The True Tragedy of Richard the Third is typical. Unhorsed in the midst of battle, he expresses his calamity in a word picture which conveys his rank and the momentousness of his situation. He likens himself to a superior heavenly body, and his defeat to a cosmic event: "downe is thy sunne Richard, never to shine again" (1990-1991).

The manifold ways of handling the image of the sun to heighten royal speeches are dependent upon the dramatist's personal style, and what he chooses to make of the royal characters to whom he assigns the lines. George Peele, we remember, made Queen Elinor reach for grandeur on behalf of her child in King Edward the First. The sun again provides the crucial "picture" to elevate the infant prince. The Prince of Wales, says the queen, should "glister like the Summers Sunne. . . as rich as Jove when he triumphs" (1775-1777). The heightened language, invoking images too hot and ripe for an infant in a comic episode, is inflated further with the second image of a pagan god whose victories, including the overthrow of his father, were notoriously miscellaneous. All out of proportion to the purpose, the queen's splendid vision collapses, having reflected only her extravagant and tactless imagination.

The dramatist might also choose to express the "character" of royalty and royal importance through sun imagery in speeches for the king's associates. In a speech for Dordan in Gorboduc, Norton's handling of the image of the sun -- which he does not even explicitly mention, but only implies -- argues that the recklessness of royal youths is a catastrophe for other mortals. As Ferrex's councillor, Dordan evokes the sun by recalling a familiar fable to give weight to his observations on the nature of the two young kings:

> Lo such are they now in the royall throne
> As was rashe Phaeton in Phebus carre.
> Ne then the fiery stedes did draw the flame
> With wilder randon through the kindled skies,
> Than traitorous counsell now will whirle about
> The youthfull heades of these unskilfull kinges.
> (II, i, 203-208)

Norton has purposely shifted emphasis from the headstrong Phaeton to the horses, merging the two explicit parts of his verbal picture in order to characterize the pair of princes as uncontrollable beasts running away with the kingdom, just as Apollo's horses ran away with the sun. Dordan's imagery heightens his language, elevating the princely actions to an importance appropriate to the circumstances and to royal rank. But at the same time, he lowers our estimation of Porrex and Ferrex by suggesting their bestial nature, and by subtly transferring the royal image of the sun from royal personages to the idea of the royal state in their charge.

Some spectacular images have connotative links to each other through common qualities. The sun, which we have selected for special attention because of its singular relevance to royalty, belongs to a cluster of images which includes light, fire, day, and so forth. In

Tudor royal drama, this light cluster sometimes makes connections with other image clusters, for example, with the imagery of gardens and fertility, because light is the source of the power of growth. On the other hand, light imagery has divine associations, because light traditionally, in Christian as well as classical literature, signifies spiritual understanding and is the symbol of God as the source of life and power.[4]

This particular group of images, then, including the sun which stage royalty prefers for speeches, is part of a web of metaphors which may, if the dramatic poet wishes, encompass the universe of living and celestial things in their hierarchical patterns. The scope of this cluster makes its member images among the more important of the verbal images uttered in royal speeches. Light imagery, especially the image of the sun, evokes royalty's place in the hierarchy of nature, princely claims to divine appointment, and the king's authority over earthly things. The image of the sun conveys metaphorically the reach of royal authority and significance far beyond what could be dramatized visually in the king play. Royal personae of Tudor drama adorn their speeches with sun and light imagery for the same reason that they adorn their persons with golden apparel and keep golden objects about them: to distinguish themselves from mortals of lesser rank, and to impress others with their sublime and far-reaching nature.

As we shall see, light imagery even occurs in royal speeches in Tudor king plays which have little other imagery of any kind. We shall continue to notice sun and light imagery, fused with other kinds, in royal speeches, and we shall observe more subtle ways the dramatic poets could treat it to express the aspirations, the pretensions, and, in a word, the "character" of the king figure using it.

Our first few examples of royal speeches heightened by imagery denoting the superiority of kingly rank suggest that the dramatic effect of a certain word picture depended much upon the context of the image as it had appeared elsewhere, even where it might have no clearly metaphoric sense. The common lore and familiar literature gave the image symbolic meanings in its new context. Many symbols, like the sun, had more than one meaning. They could be "multivocal."[5] The first image of the sun quoted above, King Richard's, connects a king's sway with diurnal revolutions, nature's shortest cycle, and thence with the idea of night and day. The chain of conventional meanings attached to this way of using the image of the sun qualifies the king's importance considerably. Richard's language is heightened by using it, but that does not elevate him unconditionally. He may be eclipsed. Queen Elinor's sun image absurdly links a new-born prince with the cycle of the seasons, with the idea of lusty maturity, and with the marvelous conquests attributed to pagan supernatural powers. In our third example, the image of the sun is tacitly summoned to mind by way of a classical fable, with all of its symbolic ramifications, to make a pair of royal brothers seem like unruly animals run amok with the source of life, Dordan's conception of the kingdom.

Miss Spurgeon has done a useful chore in charting the many topics of imagery she found in Shakespearean and Marlovian drama.[6] The same topics of imagery that she lists occur in other Tudor drama, too, furnishing a picture-language to heighten royal speeches. Of further help in understanding the Tudor dramatists' intentions in portraying royalty through metaphoric language are the contemporaneous analogues of the images they used most frequently.[7] Any imagery uttered by the king, or about him by others, was usually a "shorthand" reference, virtually a key or cipher for conventionally known images of considerable complexity.

Knowing something of the ordinary Sixteenth Century contexts of favourite images, we can tell more surely whether a dramatic poet has used a spoken picture to elevate or to demean his princely characters; we can sense more precisely the spirit of the imagery he composes for royalty. It makes a difference whether an image referring to royal personae seems closely related to Neoplatonic philosophy and metaphysics -- one source of the abundant light and fire imagery in England from John Colet's time forward[8] -- or whether the verbal picture derives from the Bible's apocalyptic and prophetic imagery; from Seneca's and Jasper Heywood's garden, animal, and evil weather metaphors, and their figures of civic woe;[9] from proverbs, almanacs, or sermons; or from Thomas Lydgate's quaint "aureate dew."

To illustrate the last source of imagery first, we can look at the heightened language of the King and Queen of Marcylle in Mary Magdalene. The royal couple address each other in the vaguely picturesque language associated with Lydgate's court poetry of the early Fifteenth Century by his admiring imitators in Henry VII's time.[10] In our early Sixteenth Century religious play, however, the poet's imitation of Lydgate's manner heightens royal speeches of mutual flattery. The queen describes her royal spouse in glittery exclamations:

the bounteest, and the boldes onder baner bryth!
no creatur so coroscant to my consolacyon!
whan the regent be resydent, ittis my refeccyon;
yower dilectabyll dedes devydytt me from dyversyte;
. . . . . . . . . .
To be pleȝant to yower person, ittis my prosperyte.
(II, 21, 952-957)

To the king, the queen is a "berel brytest of bewte!" and a "robu rody as þe rose!" (II, 21, 958-959):

In my syth,
of delycyte most deycyows;
of falachyp most felecyows,
of alle fodys most favarows,
o! my blysse! In beuteus bryghth!
(II, 21, 945-949)

This nonsensical jargon of superlatives and bizarre coinages conveys an impression of shininess, although much of the effect is produced by the sound of the words alone. Even so, it is an intensification of language through images. Since the king and the queen talk like this to each other before their conversion to Christianity, we are not surprised to find the speech of the vice Luxuria touched with the same imprecise but dazzling elegance when she flirts with the King of Flesh:

O ye prynse, how I am full of ardent lowe,
with sparkylles full of amerowsnesse. . . .
(I, 7, 352-353)

This time, it is the "sparkylles" which make us feel that we may have seen something, and that whatever is talked of is at least spectacular, if not truly grand. The important point, though, is that a parody of a certain style of composing imagery, familiar to many Englishmen through printed editions of Lydgate's work, served in Sixteenth Century England, to designate an imitation of courtly eloquence. The aureate style was a form of heightened language suitable for certain kinds of princely characters pretending to be aglow. The hazy-bright picture-making words contribute a not very admirable detail to the portrait of the royal couple speaking the lines, and its deprecatory effect is reinforced and expanded because of the unsavory character who uses that language, too. The dramatist's device of using this particular kind of light imagery to elevate his royal personae conditionally was surely noticeable to his audience, for, besides the isolated specimens of "ornacy" that we have mentioned, the play contains no imagery at all, except in simple reinforcement of spectacle.

The author of The True Tragedy of Richard the Third drew upon another well-known source of imagery to intensify the language of a king figure, with the result that certain traits accrue to the royal "personality." We have already quoted Richard's elevated imagery of the sun during his fatal battle, language that presented him in diminishing glory. In an earlier scene, before Richard gets the crown, he speaks rather differently. Here he is, reacting to bad news with a farrago of proverbial imagery that pretends to mystify while it sounds dangerous:

> Tush shadow without a substance, and a feare without
> a cause: but yet if my neighbours house bee on fire,
> let me seeke to save mine owne, in trust is treason,
> time slippeth, it is ill jesting with edge tooles, or
> dallying with Princes matters, Ile strike whillst the
> yron is hote. . . .
> (468-472)

Fire, an image belonging to the light cluster, is there, but only in a homely context.

John Bale follows a tradition of reserving light imagery to heighten speeches in situations of special sublimity, but he uses it to elevate a figure of royalty. "Englande hath a quene," he makes the reformed Nobility say, "whych maye be a lyghte, to other princes all . . . ." (B: 2624-2625). The author of The True Tragedy does likewise. The sun may go down for Richard, but when a character compliments Queen Elizabeth as "the lampe that keeps faire Englands light" (2202), we know she has divine qualities.

From the heightening of royal speeches with the special images conveying the king's majesty, or his want of it, we turn to another way in which theatrical language allowed dramatists to represent their royal characters as the dynamic beings rulers are supposed to be in reality. Closer to the business of composing scenic imagery around the king figure to express the royal status and situation, the report of unstaged scenes of royal consequence reached into the affairs of princes in widespread places, and showed their various faces to the world. Through language, the king figure's theatre of action could extend beyond the limits of his stage, or, conversely, shrink to the compass of his inward thoughts through which he might touch celestial realms and infernal regions.

Theoretically, nearly everything about royalty that the dramatist could present scenically, he could reproduce also in language. Relying on the connotations of the words in the dialogue, he could evoke in the imagination of the audience the figures of the kings, and the semblances of events and phenomena pertaining to royalty. He could verbally produce the royal props, costumes, and scenic devices mentioned in Chapter V. He could simulate the gestures and postures of kings and the personae around them, could compose the royal tableaux, and could imitate configurations of action in which kings took part. With words only, the dramatic poet could call to mind the mythological, historical, and real princely personages he might have presented visually, had he the opportunity or the need to do so. Verbally, also, he could project the moral lesson to be derived from an emblematic combination of scenic effects relevant to kings.

These uses of language in the drama of royalty, not always completely separable from other effects, make the word a substitute for scene. The substitution of language for scenic representation was a specialty of Tudor dramatists which Coleridge early recognized as a basis of Shakespeare's dramatic and poetic genius:

> . . . I should have conjectured from these poems [Venus and Adonis and The Rape of Lucrece], that even then the great instinct, which impelled the poet to the drama, was secretly working in him, prompting him by a series and never broken chain of imagery, always vivid and, because unbroken, often minute; by the highest effort of the picturesque in words, of which words are capable, . . . to provide a substitute for that visual language, that constant intervention and running comment by tone, look and gesture, which in his dramatic works he was entitled to expect from the players.[11]

Much of the dialogue already quoted in previous chapters from Tudor king plays illustrates the substitution of language for spectacle to enlarge the theatre of royalty's doings through the economy of words. For example, in Thomas Preston's Cambyses King of Persia, Ambidexter describes a royal banquet we never see (sig. E4 $^r$). Bailo's speech, in Gascoigne's and Kinwelmersh's Jocasta, reproduces the royal tableau of Polynices's camp outside the city represented on the stage (I, ii, 156-159). Queen Elinor's complaint about Wales as she alights from her litter in Peele's King Edward the First introduces a highly coloured glimpse of the pomp of her former life in the Holy Land (1122-1130).

Of the Battle of Bosworth Field, which, in The True Tragedy of Richard the Third, decides which man will be king, the audience gets only two fragmentary glimpses. "The battell enters, Richard wounded, with his Page" (1984). The king cries for a fresh horse, then runs out to resume fighting "offstage." Then, "Enters Richmond to battell againe, and kils Richard" (2001). But two speeches help the audience envision the whole battle between the contenders for the crown. One is Richmond's speech outlining his strategy:

> But now my Lords touching the placing of our battell best,
> And how we may be least indangered,
> Because I will be foremost in this fight,
> To incounter with that bloodie murtherer,
> My selfe wil lead the vaward of our troope,
> My Lord of Oxford, you as our second selfe,
> Shall . . . have the happie leading of the reare,
> . . . . . . . . . . .
> And Captaine Blunt, Peter Landoyse and you,
> Shall by in quarters, as our battels scowtes,
> Provided, thus your bow-men Captaine Blunt,
> Must scatter here and there to gaull their horse,
> As also when that our promised frends do come,
> Then must you hold hard skirmish with our foes,
> Till I by cast of a counter march,
> Have joynd our power with those that come to us,
> Then casting close, as wings on either side,
> We will give a new pravado on the foe.
> Therefore let us towards Aderstoe amaine,
> Where we this night God-willing wilt encampe,
> From thence towards Lichfield, we will march next day. . . .
> (1745-1765)

None of these events need be staged; words rapidly sketch the battle details.

After Richmond's victory, which presumably results from this strategy, Richard's Page provides another vignette of royalty at war:

> . . . Richard came to the fielde mounted on horsback, with as high resolve as fierce Achillis mongst the sturdie Greekes, whom to encounter worthie Richmond, came accompanied with many followers, and then my Lord displayed his colours straight, and with the charge of Trumpet, Drum, and Fyfe, these brave batalians straight encountred, but in the skirmish which continued long, My Lord gan faint, which Richmond straight perceived, and presently did sound afresh alarme, but worthie Richard that did never flie, but followed honour to the gates of death, straight spurd his horse to encounter with the Earle, in which encountring Richmond did prevail, & taking Richard at advantage, then he threw his horse and him both to the ground, and there was woorthie Richard wounded. . . .
>
> (2018-2030)

In Locrine, Albanact, the young king of the North, asks for a report on the invaders of Britain:

> But tell me cousin, camst thou through the plaines?
> And sawst thou there the faint heart fugitives
> Mustring their weather-beaten souldiers,
> What order keep they in their marshalling?
> (684-687)

Thrasimachus obliges, but his account is rather different from the king's expectations:

> After we past the groves of Caledone,
> Where murmuring rivers slide with silent streames.
> We did behold the stragling Scithians campe,
> Repleat with men, storde with munition;
> There might we see the valiant minded knights
> Fetching carriers along the spatious plaines,
> Humber and Hubba arm'd in azure blew,
> Mounted upon their coursers white as snow,
> Went to behold the pleasant flowring fields;
> Hector and Troialus, Priamus lovely sonnes,
> Chafing the Graecians over Simoeis,
> Were not to be compared to these two knights.
> (688-699)

The king is impressed with his vassal's powers of description:

> Well hast thou painted out in eloquence
> The portraiture of Humber and his Sonne;
> (700-701)

but he is not overwhelmed:

> Yet should they not escape our conquering swords,
> Or boast of ought but of our clemencie.
> (703-704)

Earlier in the same play, Corineius tries to comfort the dying King Brutus with a lively summary of the old king's conquests in his heyday:

> Your highnesse knows how many victories
> How many trophees I erected have,
> Tryumphantly in every place we came
> The Grecian Monarke warlike *Pandrassus*,
> And all the crew of the Molosians,
> *Gossarius* the arme strong of king of Gaules,
> And all the borders of great *Aquitaine*,
> Have felt the force of our victorious armes,
> And to their cost beheld our chivalrie,
> Where ere *Ancora* handmayd of the Sunne,
> Where ere the Sun-bright gardiant of the day,
> Where ere the joyfull day with chearfull light,
> Where ere the light illuminates the word,
> The Troyans glorie flies with golden wings,
> Wings that do soare beyond fell envious flight,
> The fame of Brutus and his followers
> Pearceth the skies. . . .
> (78-94)

The audience may imagine a map of Europe, even the spectacle of the universe, with the king and his warriors moving from place to place, new "trophees" gleaming in their wake of destruction.

The device of the letter may describe in little what a king has been doing "offstage." In *King Johan*, John Bale makes Usurpid Power read in a bishop's written complaint that Kyng Johan is being hard on the churches, and

> In his ꝑlament, he demaundeth of þe clargy
> for his warres þe tent, of þe chyrches patrymony.
> (A: 901-902)

This is a rapid presentation of a king-in-council tableau which another playwright might choose to stage. Earlier, Sedysyon's bragging informs us of happenings in the realm which are of concern to the king:

> Tush, usurpyd power, dothe faver me of all men
> for in his trobles, I ease his hart now & then
> whan prynce rebell, agenste hys autoryte
> I make ther commons, agenst them for to be
> twenty Md men, are but a mornyng breckefast
> to be slayne for hym, he takyng his repast.
> (A: 744-749)

The same character's catalogue of disguises likewise substitutes word pictures for scene, evoking a variety of costumery which is, in effect, an imaginary procession of characters who are the king's enemies:

> sumtyme I can be, a monke in a long syd cowle
> sumtyme I can be, a none. & loke lyke an owle
> . . . . . . . . . . .
> I am ower syre John, sumtyme wt a new shaven crowne
> sumtyme þe person, & swepe þe stretes wt a syd gowne
> . . . . . . . . . .
> yea to go farder, sumtyme I am a cardynall
> yea sumtyme a pope, & than am I lord over all
> . . . . . . . . . .
> & do weare. iiij crownes, whan I am in my glorye.
> (A: 197-212)

Mors's sermon, in *Ludus Coventriae,* puts into words what is supposed to be happening to Herod after the Diabolus has carried the dead king's body away:

> Now is he as pore as I
> wormys mete is his body
> his sowle in helle full peynfully
> of develis is al to-torn.
> (20: 255-258)

In a speech that bodes ill for the four vacillating kings in the Coming of Antichrist (XXIII), Zacharias, one of *The Chester Plays'* prophets, describes the appearance of the four horses of the Apocalypse -- red, black, white, and "diverse" coloured -- as four winds which will precede the second coming of Christ, "that prince which is of posty" (XXII, 70). The spectacle of the horses is not provided for in the drama; Zacharias's prophetic speech is its substitute. We are relieved when the kings later make decisions that allow them to avoid the consequences of these formidable destroyers and the other projected disasters at the world's end, none of which the audience actually gets to see.

The detail with which language may reproduce a royal "scene" may range from the simple utterance of a name -- Queen Elizabeth, for instance -- a mere allusion to strike the audience's memory, to the evocation of a familiar emblematic image or a highly refined reconstruction of an action. In The True Tragedy of Richard the Third, Jane Shore's complaints to Fortune evoke the picture of Fortune's turning wheel which was familiar to Sixteenth Century Englishmen. Her language creates what amounts to an emblematic scenic device for the play, one which never appears before the audience's eyes except in the metaphoric form of a series of scenes. Thomas Sackville composed a speech for Marcella, in Gorboduc, which animates, almost movement by movement, a configuration of action among royal personae:

> The noble prince, pearst with the sodeine wound,
> Out of his wretched slumber hastely start,
> Whose strength now fayling straight he overthrew,
> When in the fall his eyes even new unclosed
> Behelde the Queene, and cryed to her for helpe.
> We then, alas, the ladies which that time
> Did there attend, seing that heynous deede,
> And hearing him oft call the wretched name
> Of mother, and to crye to her for aide,
> Whose direfull hand gave him the mortall wound,
> Pitying (alas) for nought els could we do,
> His ruthefull end, ranne to the wofull bedde. . . .
> (IV, ii, 204-215)

Her words are a substitute for the movements, gestures, and expressions of the actors who, had the murder scene been staged, would have impersonated the queen, the prince, and the others who distractedly run to staunch the wound with napkins.

In the extreme, whole battles could be played out in words alone, as messengers arrived on stage with accounts of fresh mishaps and new annoys. Thomas Hughes devoted a long episode to a Nuntius's account of the battle to the death between King Arthur and Mordred, retailing the "boystrous bangs" and "thumping thwacks" which disposed of whole armies before kingly father and usurping son hew each other down (The Misfortunes of Arthur, IV, ii).

But to appreciate more fully the artistry of Tudor dramatists in representing royalty and royal affairs through the substitution of language for scenic representation we need to consult the masters of rhetoric from whom Sixteenth Century English dramatists learned the art of speechmaking for princely characters and their associates. Throughout the Renaissance there was a close affinity between the art of the drama and the art of oratory, expressed in rhetoric books based on the classical authority of Cicero and Quintilian.[12] The humanist rhetoricians understood the report of unstaged scenes, objects, and personae as a form of theatrical imagery designed to convince the hearers of the existence of invisible things. Erasmus looked to the drama in the first place for some of his principles and for examples of the technique of picturing things and ideas in words, instructive knowledge which he passed on to the numerous English readers of his Copia (1512), a textbook for English speechmakers. How closely connected in his mind were the orator and the dramatic poet as makers of images out of words appears in his introduction to his section on Evidentia:

> We shall enrich speech by a description of a thing or [person] when we do not relate what is done, or has been done, summarily or sketchily, but place it before the reader painted in all the colours of rhetoric so that at length it draws the hearer or reader outside himself as in the theatre. The Greeks call this . . . painting the picture of things.[13]

Examples of painting in words, Erasmus explains, are abundant in the writings of poets and historians, "But especially are the narratives of messengers in tragedies remarkably rich in this excellence, because they are presented instead of the spectacle and they report the things which it is either impossible or inappropriate to present on the stage."[14] Besides places and times, Erasmus would set before the "eyes" of his hearers descriptions of persons, including personifications of abstract ideas, stereotypes of common opinions, and character sketches, like those in comedies; and "things," including actual things, abstractions, and true and false events. Under the same category, Erasmus suggests attributing speeches to gods, places, and "other things without speech." Naturally, the dramatists did not follow Erasmus to the letter.

In his Arte of English Poesie (c. 1569-1585), George Puttenham comes at the same subject from a slightly different angle, describing counterfeit representation, or the imitation of the appearance of things, with examples drawn from poetry:

> The matter and occasion leadeth us many times to describe and set fooreth many things, in such sort as it should appeare they were truly before our eyes though they were not present, which to do it requireth cunning: for nothing can be kindly counterfait or represented in his absence, but by great discretion in the dooer.[15]

Things which are not natural or not veritable ask even more cunning to describe than real things, he adds. Among the things which the poet or maker may describe as true or natural, or which he may feign as artificial and not true are the appearance, speech, and countenance of the dead or absent, the personification of qualities and insensible things ("counterfait personation"), and time, place, and action.

Puttenham's insistence on the counterfeiting function of verbal imagery, and Erasmus's concern with it as a form of "evidence" are as useful to understanding dramas portraying kings as the idea of substituting words for scene. Both writers point to some complicated objectives of the dramatic poets when they depicted royalty's affairs and "character" in language. A single comparative example shows the difference between words and scenic representation in the portrayal of royalty through "painting in words." The author of The True Tragedy of Richard the Third produced in words an emblematic picture of the king rather similar to that which Thomas Preston dramatized in Cambyses King of Persia, a scene described in Chapter V. For King Richard also, the heart is an important symbolic object:

> . . . and this, I this verie day, I hope with this lame hand of mine, to rake out that hatefull heart of Richmond, and when I have it, to eate it panting hote with salt, and drinke his blood luke warme, tho I be sure twil poyson me.
> (1977-1981)

The dramatist had several reasons for putting into words this alarming picture of a king devouring the heart of his challenger. One reason is that the king's speech, piling up details absurdly, exaggerates his ferociousness to comical proportions. Handled in this way, language swiftly and efficiently undermines the seriousness of this wicked king, as scenic treatment seems not to have done to King Cambises. The action produced in words instead of scene underscores Richard's "character" as an actor, and further, insists upon the sheer staginess, the unreality of his villainy.

By representing royal actions in words, the dramatic poet availed himself of several advantages. First, the words could imitate the appearances of invisible things, things which never happened, things which only ought to happen, thoughts, dreams, deceptions, and wishes, even happenings that seem to contradict what is produced scenically, or reported elsewhere in the king's drama. As she reports the moments when the prince expires, Marcella movingly describes an invisible event:

> And straight pale death pressing within his face
> The flying ghost his mortall corpes forsooke.
> (Gorboduc, IV, ii, 225-226)

To the dramatist composing a portrait of royalty, a second advantage of setting forth a scene in words is that the speeches are spoken by characters who have roles to play and functions to fulfill in the dramatic action. The speakers possess moral and social "characters" or "personalities" of their own, whether they are themselves figures of royalty, or are only those with whom the princely personae have to deal. Speeches are, in fact, a king of action, too, no matter how much imagery they contain imitating or falsely reporting scenic action. Thus, the information presented in a report of action and things contributes to the motives of the speaker, signifying his intentions vis-a-vis royalty and royalty's office and situation. King Herod briefly evokes a terrifying scene with his threats, in Herod's Killing of the Children:

> Thei shall suffre woo and peyn • thurgh bak and syde,
> with a very myschaunce • ther flesshe shall be al to-rent.
> (I, 73-74)

Although this king purports to describe what could happen, he may be bluffing. The picture evoked in his speech mainly provides him with a "psychology." His motive is to frighten his audience with what he might do. Similarly, in so far as it is a wish, King Richard's hope to eat Richmond's heart, in The True Tragedy of Richard the Third, adds a psychological dimension to a royal character's "personality."

Kings, queens, and their associates among the drama's personae, therefore, might speak as if for effect, as if choosing the words they utter and the scenes they describe for their appeal to an audience. In Norton's and Sackville's Gorboduc, the speeches of the advisers and parasites of old King Gorboduc and his princely sons illustrate some of the manifold treatments of scene created through language. They intend their staged "orations" to persuade royalty to certain courses of action. Tyndar's description of Ferrex's court, for example, is calculated to excite Porrex's ire:

> I saw my selfe the great prepared store
> Of horse, of armour, and of weapon there,
> Ne bring I to my lorde reported tales
> Without the ground of seen and searched trouth.
> Loe secrete quarrels runne about his court,
> To bring the name of you my lorde in hate.
> Ech man almost can now debate the cause,
> . . . . . . . . . . .
> The wiser sort holde downe their griefull heades.
> Eche man withdrawes from talke and company,
> Of those that have bene knowne to favour you.
> To hide the mischiefe of their meaning there,
> Rumours are spread of your preparing here.
> . . . . . . . . . . .
> In secrete I was counselled by my frendes,
> To hast me thence. . . .
> (II, ii, 6-26)

We have no assurance, other than the speaker's own assertions, that Tyndar's memory is accurate, or that his report of offstage scenes, events, attitudes, and figures is true. That Porrex responds as he does to this persuasive language defines him as either gullible, or half persuaded of his brother's duplicity before Tyndar begins his speech.

The language of Queen Videna, in the same play, reveals that her motivations are seated in a unique cluster of emotions, governed in part by what she wants her hearers to know of her mental state. Regarded as accounts of unstaged scenes, Videna's imagery, a mad congestion of tigers, tombs, and the physiology of motherhood, turns her soul inside out, as it were, displaying her "psychology" for all to examine. For this implacable woman, day is scarcely less evil and depressing than night:

> The silent night, that bringes the quiet pawse,
> From painefull travailes of the wearie day,
> Prolonges my carefull thoughtes, and makes me blame
> The slowe Aurore, that so for love or shame
> Doth long delay to shewe her blushing face,
> And now the day renewes my griefull plaint.
> (I, i, 1-6)

The queen's reports of her sacrificial offerings suggest a state of mind that perversely creates its own causes for suffering, and blames fate for its wretchedness:

> The end the Goddes do know, whose altars I
> Full oft have made in vaine, of cattell slaine
> To send the sacred smoke to heavens throne,
> For thee my sonne, if thinges do so succede
> As now my jelous minde misdemeth sore.
> (I, i, 35-39)

It is Videna's destiny, so she thinks, to make sacrifices, and make them she does. If only fate or fortune had taken her to the grave long ago, had she only fallen downstairs or been swallowed by an earthquake -- or so she argues with herself in soliloquy, conjuring affecting pictures of herself out of her imagination -- her doleful mind would not be so afflicted now (IV, i, 1-22). Always, even "alone," or with only the play's chorus and audience as witness, the queen is setting forth a scene in words for its effect on others, to persuade whoever might hear that her woes have causes beyond her control. Her misery is a pose that she maintains at all times, as if she had misconstrued Erasmus's advice to royalty, to behave forever as if on display.[16] As sometimes may happen in royal drama when the poet employs a reported scene, the speaker's language seems as convincing to himself as to anyone else.

Our point about reports serving to convey the "internal scene" of the speaker, who is himself selecting words to influence others, is more delightfully illustrated by a report of a nobleman to his king in The Wars of Cyrus. The anonymous playwright gave Araspas more than thirty lines of verse to describe the charms of Panthea, Queen of

Susa, with the result that we know a little more about Araspas's "character," and the "character" of the king who is his audience. In this speech, Araspas attempts to persuade Cyrus to accept Panthea personally as a spoil of war, although the king has ordered all fruits of conquest to be divided amongst his tributary armies. According to Araspas, Panthea is

> A woman so richly imbellished
> With beautie and perfection of the minde
> As never any mortall creature was.
> (I, 3, 282-284)

Her philosophical learning aside, it is Panthea's physical charms which Araspas has observed most closely:

> Her haire as radiant as is Tag[u]s sand,
> And softer than the streame [which on] it runnes;
> Her lillie cheekes, all died with ruddie blush,
> Castes such reflection to the standers by
> As doth the union of ten thousand sunnes.
> (I, 3, 285-289)

Her neck, her eyes, her voice challenge Araspas's powers of eloquence He reports a little tableau, enlivened by mime:

> The harmonie she makes would ravish you;
> She weepes and plaies while both her handmaids sing,
> And sighes at everie straine, using that note
> Which Orpheus sings for [Eurydice].
> With wringed hands her waiting maids keepe time
> Upon their mournefull breasts, as were we flint
> We could not chuse but melt to heare their songs.
> (I, 3, 304-310)

Obviously, it is Araspas who is ravished by Panthea's loveliness and pitiful situation. His plea to the king to keep her in camp is a ploy in his own interest, a fact which Cyrus readily perceives:

> Men are in folly when they are in love.
> Urge me no more, I will not visite her;
> For by the eie love slips into the heart. . . .
> (I, 3, 336-338)

This chapter described and illustrated two ways among many in which language can define "character" in Tudor stage royalty. These are, first, the heightening of royal language with imagery, and, secondly, the description of events, things, and places, bringing a wide range of royalty's affairs within the scope of the stage. This discussion concludes the survey of the treatment of royalty in theatrical imagery, presented in scene and in language. The next chapter will show how Tudor dramatists portrayed king figures and other royalty through the intermingling of scenic representation and language, a study which will permit us finally to analyze several fresh plays for the theme they have in common about the nature of royalty.

# Chapter VII

The last two chapters considered spectacle and language as separate elements in the dramatization of princely characters in Tudor plays. Our illustrations from the plays demonstrated that scenic representation and language both make distinct contributions to the portrayal of kings and other royal figures, but a more important objective is to appreciate the representation of royalty through their combination. The discussion promised in Chapter V of scenic representation and speech together in royal drama is the subject of this chapter.

Before examining forms of theatrical imagery as they are intermingled in king plays, it is best to summarize briefly what has been said of them so far. First, Chapter V dealt with visual or scenic imagery, the spectacle of the king play, in all its colour, shapes, and movements, simulating real things and events associated with royalty and the magnificence of the royal show. It explained the dramatization of royal personae through symbolic objects, mime and gesture, tableaux, and configurations of action. It examined also three special treatments of scenic imagery typical of Tudor dramatic art portraying royalty: scenic allusions to historical, superhuman, mythological, and abstract figures, and even to living personages; the emblematic scene and its mimed counterpart, the dumbshow; and the patterns of scenic repetition and contrast through which the dramatist could influence the expectations and understanding of the audience about the king.

Then, Chapter VI attended to aspects of the language of Tudor drama which help define the royal personae. It dwelt in particular on two ways in which speech is of special significance for portraying royalty: one, the heightening of royal speeches with imagery conveying the status of the king figure, his aspirations, and pretensions; and, another, reports of and allusions to scenes and action involving royalty which are inappropriate to stage. Reports and allusions evoke in words the wide range of royalty's affairs and influence to contribute to the dramatization of the king figure's motives.

This chapter, which treats scenic representation and language as they are bound together by the dramatist's design, shows how theatrical imagery could enrich and refine the portrait of royalty further. We shall begin to see that the coordination of spectacle and language may powerfully impress the audience with the dramatist's vision of the nature of royalty.

With so many conventionally accepted devices for composing the drama of kings, the variety of effects produced by language and spectacle combined was limited only by the dramatist's artistic necessity as he made his king play, by the range of his knowledge and imagination, and by his individual gifts for expression. The complexity of this subject, together with the ingenuity of the playwrights means approaching the subject from several different directions.

A frequent practice of Tudor dramatists is to reinforce the spectacle of the king with speeches. A simple example is a speech quoted in Chapter V from Mary Magdalene, in which the King of the

World describes the emblems of his costume or his attributes. In fact, all we know now about this character's regalia is what we gather from his elucidation of his symbolic ornaments. He seems burdened with "all þis rych tresor" (I, 7, 323), gold, silver, and baser metals. He points out the several kinds, one at a time, explaining their connection with the heavenly bodies, some of which are named for pagan deities and aligned with specific temperaments and properties, and all of them identified at the end as the "vij prynsys of hell" (I, 7, 324). Even this speech does not tell very much. For all we know, the costume of the King of the World might have been embellished with representations of the occult things he mentions in his speech. But as he gestured and pointed according to the demands of his lines, he informed the spectators of the significance of the adornments they could see. His language reinforces, and even enlarges upon the visible objects that provide, as noted before, details about the kinds of evil associated with the royal figures, Tiberius and Herod, who belong to this abstract king character's moral company.

Likewise, much information about the costumes of the many Herods, beyond the items of expenditures in municipal and craft guild records, is extracted from speeches intended to call the king's fine clothes to the notice of spectators. As is true with nearly everything that happens in drama, Herod's bragging speeches have more than one purpose. When he claims to be the "comelyeste kynge clad in gleterynge golde" (Ludus Coventriae, 18: 9), Herod identifies himself as royalty, and characterizes himself as a boaster and a dandy. But his words have the additional function of reinforcing the spectacle he makes.

Even though his armour may have been made of gilded pasteboard, his audience was supposed to see it as pure gold, and to think of Herod's social significance accordingly. As in the case of the King of the World, the fragmentary allusions to his dress that occur in Herod's speeches support and enlarge upon his costume.

The dramatists of the Coventry Shearmen and Taylors' pageant were reinforcing scenic imagery with language when they gave their Magi speeches announcing their symbolic gifts to the Christ Child at the manger:

I. Rex. A cupe-full [of] golde here I have the broght,
In toconyng thow art with-out pere.
(703-704)

II. Rex. In toconyng of preste[h] od and dyngnete of offece,
To the I offur a cupe-full of in-sence.
(706-707)

III. Rex. I have broght the myre for mortalete,
In to-cunyng thou schalt mankynd restore.
(710-711)

Perfunctory as they are, the descriptions of the gifts repeat the impression made by the visible objects which the three kings present to a divine character. Speech enlarges upon the symbolic meaning of these objects, and reflects upon the "character" of the donors. The earthly kings give presents to a divine king which are appropriately royal and mystical.

Simple as the mingling of spectacle and language may seem in the dramatization of the Magi, Herod, and the King of the World, it is not so simple in its effects in other Tudor king plays. An image of stick-breaking which appears at the beginning of Gorboduc's first act appears in the Chorus's speech two scenes later. The same image appearing first in scene and then in words to present a single complex idea about royalty's affairs raises the question whether Tudor dramatists recognized that spectacle had a more lasting quality than the more fluid poetic imagery; whether, that is, scene had a property of imprinting the memory with an after-image which could to some extent override the limitations of drama as a temporal art.

The image in question appears in Gorboduc first as a configuration of action made memorable by distinctive costume. Six wildmen, dressed in leaves, enter in the dumbshow:

> . . . the first bare in his necke a fagot of small stickes. which they all both severally and together assayed with all their strengthes to breake, but it could not be broken by them.
>
> (I, Dumbshow, 3-5)

Finally, one wildman plucks a single stick from the bundle, and breaks it, and the rest follow suit until all the sticks are broken, "which being conjoyned they had before attempted in vaine" (I, Dumbshow, 8-9). It seems an extravagant treatment of a commonplace metaphor. But at the end of Act One the Chorus of "four auncient and sage men of Brittaine" recall this vivid dumbshow scene of stick-breaking. Without mentioning the wildmen specifically, they repoint the moral lesson of the emblematic scene by incorporating the stick-breaking action with other symbolic images to comment on the king's succession policy:

> Eche chaunge of course unjoynts the whole estate,
> And yeldes it thrall to ruyne by debate.
> The strength that knit by fast accorde in one,
> Against all forrein power of mightie foes,
> Could of it selfe defende it selfe alone,
> Disjoyned once, the former force doth lose.
> The stickes, that sondred brake so soone in twaine,
> In faggot bounde attempted were in vaine.
>
> (I, Chorus, 5-12)

If the earlier scene of the wildmen breaking sticks impressed a lingering picture on the spectator's mind, the Chorus's elliptic repetition of the action in words told him that Gorboduc's decision to "chaunge the course of his discending crowne" (I, Chorus, 20) amounted to turning the kingdom over to wildmen, that is, savages, who would quickly pluck it to pieces. Only now, the wildmen have become "all forrein power of mightie foes" (8). In such wise, Gorboduc's dramatists reinforced, supported, even transmuted and expanded the ideas presented in scene with its iteration in words, all for the purpose of elucidating the significance of a figure of royalty.

So far, these are examples of scenic imagery in royal drama which are reinforced by language. But scene could support speech, as well as the other way around. Chapter VI mentioned the Nuntius's account of the battle between King Arthur and Mordred in Hughes's Misfortunes of Arthur (IV, ii). This long report is an example of language substituting for scene. In the Fifth Act, however, the fatally wounded Arthur himself appears, and the body of Mordred is brought on stage. The king stays alive long enough to gasp out his regrets at what he should have done, and to show that he feels his life is ebbing (V, i, 66). The final tableau, with the Chorus of "Brytaines" (25) forming a retinue gathered about the king as their "sacred prince" serves as evidence that the messenger's story of the stupendous fight is supposed to report an "actuality." Hughes meant the audience to accept the battle in good faith as the messenger reported it. Further on, we shall see that scenic "evidence" of events reported in speeches is not necessarily "proof" of the authenticity of the king's affairs in a Tudor play.

We are still considering the mutual reinforcement of spectacle and language when we study the relationship between the actor's gestures and postures, and the imagery in a princely character's speech. The profound effect of words and scene together, in the supreme moments of royal tragedy when the actor coordinates the visual picture he makes with the poetic imagery he speaks, has received due notice from critics of Shakespearean drama who are familiar with the art of acting. The performance of kingly roles in other Tudor plays deserves attention, too.

The formal, even wooden movements and declamatory gestures appropriate for royal pomp and pageanty, for stately orations and the ritualistic utterances of the times, probably influenced the Tudor actor's performance of royal roles more than they do acting technique today.[1] Another influence was the Sixteenth Century audience's readiness to accept much "typifying" of "character," as well as extremes of passionate and flamboyant gesture. Tudor king plays have scenes and royal speeches which demand such treatments by the actors. Kyng Johan's assertions of his sovereignty, quoted in Chapter I, seem to require the actor to perform as if in a pageant designed for a royal "welcome." The King Herods ought to bluster with violent gesticulations.

Moreover, differing production conditions, from the street show at festival time to the intimate private stage or entertainment at court, dictated a variety of acting styles, just as they dictated that there be king plays of many sorts. King Herod needed broad gestures and shouts when he performed before a festival crowd of humble people from the countryside. Most of King Gorboduc's speeches need somewhat finer gestures and more subtle changes of posture within a formal decorum.

In addition, the Renaissance habit of looking for a correspondence between a person's outward appearance and his inward thought or feeling, the belief that soul and body interact to reflect each other, demanded that the Tudor actor convey the thoughts expressed in the heightened language of royal poetry through the eloquence of his body and his voice. The royal set speech, reinforced by the gestures of dignity, strength and grace that the poetry demands, becomes an expression of an ideal. The gestures reaching for sublimity or defying fate cooperate with the imagery of grandiloquence. In such moments, if the gesture fuses with the feeling of the poetry, the nature of royalty becomes the nature of aspiring humanity at large. The king figure, speaking the poetry of universal statements which some dramatic poets could compose, becomes a representative man, lifted out of the particularities of his "personality" as expressed in colloquial language and mime.[2] Chapter VIII includes an examination of one such majestic figure, Tamburlaine, for whom the reinforcement of poetry with visible gestures seems essential for the complete delineation of his "character" as a universal man, and for the effect he has on other figures in the play.

When the Tudor dramatist intended a noticeable discrepancy between a king figure's thoughts and his speech, it is more than likely that he and the player of the role found ways to make that difference visible. Earlier, we saw that such opportunities exist for Richard of The True Tragedy of Richard the Third when his speeches give him the "character" of an actor or a vice. In assessing the total "character" of the king figure, then, the unity of scene and language in his supreme moments must be judged along with those times when his gestures and his words may not be so sublime.

The combination of scenic representation and language to dramatize royalty proves to be no less complex when we consider the variety of ways Tudor dramatists could treat a single object distinctive of royal personae. The crown is just such an image, a symbolic object that is the supreme emblem of princeliness, one that could be handled in words and scene with diverse effects for the portrait of the king.

Chapter I observed that the crown was usually more than a piece of costumery useful to distinguish royalty from other kinds of characters. Sometimes it became a prop, the central object round which the action could revolve, a function which could be expressed in words as well as scene. A multiple coronation tableau quoted from Robert Greene's Alphonsus King of Aragon presents the diadem as a symbol of power. But the language of Alphonsus' speeches as he bestows the crowns upon his allies much elaborates this emblem's significance. First, he says, the crown is a reward for military services. Alphonsus then conjures a picture of how Laelius earned his crown. A glimpse of the battle shows additionally the crown's significance as an object of conquest. Laelius chased Belinus

> From troupe to troupe, from side to side about,
> And never ceast from this thy swift pursuite,
> Until thou hadst obtaind his royall Crowne.
> (781-783)

With the crown go territorial possessions, as Alphonsus informs the warriors he makes into kings. Finally, Alphonsus's heightened language circumscribes the power that the crown is intended to confer:

> Arise Albinius King of Aragon,
> Crowned by me, who till my gasping ghost
> Do part asunder from my breathlesse corpes,
> Will be thy shield against all men alive:
> That for thy kingdome any way do strive.
> (837-841)

Albinius is, therefore, a king only because Alphonsus says he is one, and gives him a crown. The diadem, treated verbally as an object of conquest and a sign of territorial possessions, is now a token of gratitude to a vassal. It belongs to Albinius only as long as Alphonsus lives to defend his underlord's right to wear it. Thus Albinius's kingship is conditioned by the circumstances under which he receives an emblem of royalty, a symbol whose scenic significance in a grandiose tableau is both enriched and delimited through the language that informs his coronation. It says something for Albinius's character that he objects to being made a king in this way.

Shakespeare made his Henry VI say "My Crowne is in my heart, not on my head" (3 Henry VI, III, i, 1460), which expresses a mystical conception of the crown's meaning. Tudor playwrights often combined scenic representation and language to dramatize the mystique of the crown as particular attitudes of particular king figures. The author of The True Tragedy of Richard III joined the spectacle of the crown with language to portray a king for whom the diadem is the symbol of a vague but nevertheless sublime glory. To Richard the earthly power concentrated in the idea of the crown is secondary, a mere complement to the desired object which confers a kind of immortality upon the wearer: the fame that "conquers death" (498). "The goale is got, and golden Crowne is wonne" (1398), Richard declares when it is on his head. "I reapt not the gaine but the glorie" (361). He likes to repeat the name of the crown, as if fondling the object itself:

> When my father got the Crowne, my brother won the Crowne,
> And I will weare the Crowne,
> Or ile make them hop without their crownes that denies me.
> (366-368)

Like the crown, the title of king is supremely important to Richard. The ideas of crown as mystical symbol and kingliness as title to eternal fame merge in a speech which conveys the essence of his attitude toward the object which someone else still wears:

> Why so, now Fortune make me a King, Fortune give me a Kingdome, let the world report the Duke of Gloster was a King; therefore Fortune make me King, if I be but King for a year, nay but halfe a yeare, . . . swounes half an houre, nay sweete Fortune, clap but the Crowne on my head, that the vassals may but once Say, God save King Richards life, it is inough.
> (433-449)

Threatened and afraid, Richard characteristically thinks of the crown on his head. The imagery of his speech helps us imagine the facial expressions and gestures which accompany his anxiety:

> Meethinkes the Crowne which I before did weare,
> Inchast with Pearle and costly Diamonds
> Is turned now into a fatall wreathe,
> Of fiery flames, and ever burning starres.
> (1409-1412)

Wounded, he refuses to fly. He clutches to his idea of the crown as he clutches the crown to himself. It is the source of his courage:

> . . . if Fates deny, this ground must be my grave,
> yet golden thoughts that reached for a Crowne. . .
> are come as comforts to my drooping heart, and bids
> me keep my Crowne and die a king.
> (1994-1998)

Another playwright allowed one of his kings to express much more dynamically than Richard a quite different mystical conception of the crown. The visible crown is the central prop in Christopher Marlowe's singular handling of the deposition scene of Edward the Second, already cited in Chapter V, but language is the medium through which Marlowe defines the peculiar significance of that emblem for the king. Within a tableau of king in state, his councillors advising him to hand over the crown, Edward expresses his vacillations in mime and poetry combined. Every shift of the king's mood is accompanied by a profusion of imagery investing the crown with a complexity of meaning impossible to convey through scene alone.

In Edward's possession, the crown symbolizes his fusion of two ideas: personal freedom as a life-spirit, and the inherent majesty of a man born to kingly office. The confusion is made ironic by the fact that the king knows his enemies will kill him as soon as he loses the protective magic of the crown. Otherwise, Edward has only passing regard for the mundane realities and responsibilities which give substance to a ruler's sway.

At first Edward thinks of kingship as imposing upon him a distinctive majesty of spirit that a private man cannot share, a spirit which his imagery nevertheless expresses as bestial -- royally bestial:

> The greefes of private men are soone allayde,
> But not of kings, the forrest Deare being strucke
> Runnes to an herbe that closeth up the wounds,
> But when the imperiall Lions flesh is gorde,
> He rends and teares it with his wrathfull pawe,
> Highly scorning, that the lowly earth
> Should drinke his bloud, mounts up into the ayre:
> And so it fares with me, whose dauntlesse mind
> The ambitious Mortimer would seeke to curbe. . .
> (2119-2127)

The gods owe him protection, yet he is himself obliged to revenge the wrongs done his princely person and regal soul.

> Full often am I sowring up to heaven,
> To plaine me to the gods against them both:
> But when I call to minde I am a king
> Me thinkes I should revenge me of [these] wronges.
> (2132-2135)

Only when the weakness of his situation strikes him do his thoughts descend toward reality:

> But what are Kings, when regiment is gone,
> But perfect shadowes in a sun-shine day?
> My nobles rule, I beare the name of King,
> I weare the crowne, but am contrould by them.
> (2137-2140)

But his attention slides quickly to the next wearer of the diadem, the odious Mortimer, perhaps. Celestial powers must uphold Edward's right to a king's immortality which the crown symbolizes, and must destroy the ignoble usurper:

> Heavens turne it to a blaze of quencheless fier,
> Or like the snakie wreath of Tisiphon,
> Engirt the temples of his hatefull head,
> So shall not Englands Vines be perished,
> But Edwards name survives, though Edward dies.
> (2155-2159)

Overwhelmed, his mind "murthered," as he says, he is on the point of giving up the crown at last when suddenly he changes his mind. He begs childishly to keep it overnight, just to gaze upon a sight comforting to his tormented soul. With the crown still on his head, he utters the simple-minded wish that the mystical power it supposedly confers might prevail forever:

> Continue ever thou celestial sunne,
> Let never silent night possesse this clime,
> Stand still you watches of the element,
> All times and seasons rest you at a stay,
> That Edward may be still faire Englands king.
> (2175-2179)

The scene is much prolonged, as Edward ranges from helpless outrage to resignation, finally giving up the crown, and with it his feeling for earthly life. He pictures himself after death, eternally a king, his spirit once more free to soar:

> Heere, heere: now sweete god of heaven,
> Make me dispise this transitorie pompe,
> And sit for aye inthronized in heaven,
> Come death, and with thy fingers close my eyes,
> Or if I live let me forget my selfe.
> (2222-2226)

The thoughts Edward expresses in words and scene, mystical as they seem, mesh perfectly with the futile personality Marlowe conceived for him. By the end of the deposition scene, the crown as symbolic object has been turned round and round with Edward's temper to exhibit its spiritual significance for the king. It represents kingliness conceived only as a personal quality blessed by supernatural powers. Despite the richly variegated imagery with which Edward adorns the meaning of his crown -- the raging imperial lion, the celestial sun, the shadows, and the English "vines" -- it is a hollow ornament, a ring of gold reflecting the narrow circularity of a king's thoughts about his office and himself. For all the impassioned poetry and expressive gesture turning heavenward the thoughts devoted to the crown, the king has only revealed the spectacle of his inward shallowness, and his dependence upon the diadem for immunity from an ordinary mortal's death.

So essential was the visible crown for the dramatization of the idea of kingliness that a bare-headed king could occasion comment in the dialogue of a play. In Hughes's Misfortunes of Arthur, a messenger approaches the beleaguered king:

> Haile peereless Prince, whiles Fortune would, our King,
> Though now bereft of Crowne and former rule.
> (III, ii, 7-8)

His mention of the crown points explicitly to its absence as a scenic device. A crownless king was to Tudor dramatists and their audience a spectacle of particular significance because he lacked the emblem he ought to have.

For the same reason -- the distinction of the crown as a mark of princely rank -- crowns and coronets demanded attention when worn by characters not considered ordinary royalty. Chapter II showed how the crown can signify the majesty, not only of kings in the ordinary sense, but of any figure who wears it, whether associated with supernatural power or personifying the abstract. Crowned figures who are not kings or princes in the sense of being earthly rulers sharply bring to notice the nature of the play's conventional royalty. In Jocasta George Gascoigne furnishes a positive and striking instance of the attention a visible crown could focus on a stage character other than a conventional king in order to invite comparison with royalty elsewhere in the play.

A blind soothsayer wears the crown in question in *Jocasta's* central third act. As Tyresias hobbles on stage, guided by his daughter, Creon, the "type of Tyranny" and Thebes's next king, asks him:

> . . . tell I pray thee; what this crowne doth meane,
> That sits so kingly on thy skilfull heade?
> (III, i, 30-31)

A bit of history Tyresias reports makes the crown the soothsayer's "right rewarde," a symbol of the accuracy of his supernatural wisdom:

> . . . I did with grave advise,
> Foretell the Citizens of *Athens* towne,
> How they might best with losse of litle bloude,
> Have victories against their enimies, . . .
> (III, i, 32-35)

Creon's speech interprets Tyresias's crown as a token of good luck for Thebes, a city now imperilled by the discord between King Eteocles and his brother, Polynices. "For common cause of this our common weale" (54), Creon invites Tyresias to divine things to come and to reveal hidden knowledge.

The spectacle of the blind crowned soothsayer matches almost exactly the spectacle of Thebes's former king, the sightless Oedipus whose daughter leads him out of Thebes in the final scene. About Oedipus's crown, however, we learn little, except that he says he slew his father, then "caught the crown" (V, v, 31). There is no evidence that this one-time king wears a crown in this scene, and, on the other hand, none that he does not. The uncertainty is disturbing.

The similarities of Tyresias and King Oedipus, signalled by scenic treatment of the crown and the elaboration of its meaning in speeches, call attention to other likenesses between these two blind-men. With the help of Sacerdos, Tyresias "reads" the entrails of a sacrificial goat to predict the fate of Thebes, his report of events which he foresees will happen. The soothsayer's configuration of action and speech have their parallels when Oedipus "reads" the corpses of his wife and sons (V, v, 159-171) to convince himself the dead are really they, as others have said they are in reports of off-stage scenes.

Gascoigne's astonishing combination of scene and language which incorporates the crown insists that he wanted his audience, the lawyers at Gray's Inn, to observe an important congruity between the soothsayer and the woeful king, a congruity arising from their examination of the visible evidence of past and future events described in reports of unstaged scenes. The repeated configurations of the two blind figures, one a former king, one wearing an obscurely acquired crown, and both led about by women, suggest the ambiguous even artificial nature of "proof" and "prophecy" concerning royalty's affairs, convincing as those demonstrations may be to the Chorus of Thebans. But Gascoigne has rendered the whole of his meaning quite obscure.

Another way to appreciate the Tudor dramatists' ingenuity in mingling the spectacle and language of royal drama is to consider how a single theme bearing on the king figure is handled in the theatrical imagery of one play. Gorboduc's image of the broken sticks, mentioned above, furnishes such a theme, one that courses deeply through the drama. As stated in the order of the first emblematic dumbshow, the stick-breaking action simply signifies that

> a state knit in unitie doth continue strong against all force. But being divided, is easely destroyed.
> (I, Dumbshow, 11-12)

The entire play is devoted to dramatizing this theme of the divided state, and its relevance to the king, in such a way that the idea of the disastrous effects of the parting of the kingdom is continually elaborated before the audience in multifarious senses, and in both scene and words.

The tragedy reverses the scheme of The Arraignment of Paris, just as it reverses the theme. Peele resolved his repeated multiplicities, the contending virtues, in the single personage of Queen Elizabeth whom he incorporated as an actor in his play. Norton's and Sackville's king, on the contrary, begins by presiding over a semblance of order, only to vanish himself in an irrevocable and accelerating breakdown of accord, as new divisions beget others, dismembering the realm.

To this end, Gorboduc has a "number logic" of its own: all pluralities and opposites express division. The solitary figures represent, not unity, but the "diverse minds" or self-interest permitting divisiveness to invade and destroy the commonweal. Queen is divided from king, prince from brother prince, royal parents from their children, councillors from king and each other, noblemen from their peers, people from the royal house. The dramaturgical design, or scenic organization, which controls the drama, employs soliloquy, debate, argument, trial, and, in the Fifth Act dumbshow, an emblematic battle to present visually the separation of the individual from his fellows, and the disagreements and dissensions forming within the groups. Repeated patterns of scenic imagery, symmetrical arrangements of contrarieties and contrasts, along with a pronounced progression toward larger and more disorderly groups on stage, all display the growing discord that plunges a kingdom into factional strife and chaos, the outcome of King Gorboduc's ill-advised division of the rule.

At the core of the play is a succession of king-in-council tableaux. Superficially, the first of these (I, ii) is the most like royal pageantry in its conduct. Over the disagreement among councillors, and the division between councillors and king, a formal order prevails. The king decorously consults his advisers, and each speaks in turn. By comparison, Gorboduc's second council (III, i) is well on the way to disintegration when it opens. Only two of the council are present; the king is visibly unstrung. As the third council begins (IV, ii), Gorboduc has only Arostos by him, and, as others gather, the scene reforms as a court of justice to hear young King Porrex's defence. In this scene, the royal father banishes one of his sons, and hears the report of his murder by the mother. After Marcella invades the chamber to bring news of Porrex's death, the scene ends in visible disorder with the king psychologically disabled.

These three important council scenes and their spectacles of progressive social ruin are supported by other group encounters. The king's first council begins only after an ominous meeting between Videna and Ferrex (I, i), the queen complaining, with a conspiratorial air, of the king's intent to divide the land. It is portentous that we first learn of partiality and discord from her, and that she plants in Ferrex's ear the first notion of an injustice done. Between the first and second royal councils are the lesser councils of the young kings in their separate states (II, i and II, ii), each a mirror image of the other with scenic configuration of good and evil councillors purveying contradictory advice. But, whereas Porrex decides his course promptly (II, ii), the scenic imagery of Ferrex's court is distinguished by an additional spectacle, the young king's display of his own divided mind (II, i, 170-193). Finally, in Act V, with the royal family dead, the king-in-council tableau is replaced by two assemblies of the lords, scenic configurations with no central focus at all except for the lone figures who remain behind to soliloquize after the exit of the rest (V, i, 125-162; ii, 180-279).

Each act of Gorboduc, moreover, is enclosed between a dumbshow and a chorus, the language of the one device enforcing the scenic imagery of the other in the manner already shown. For the first act, this framework combining words and scene establishes the key idea of the whole play: division. For the other acts, the combinations of dumbshow and chorus express progressive stages of disintegration. By Act Four, we enjoy the sight of Furies sprinkled with blood and flames, engirt with snakes, and brandishing whips, of whom the chorus does not fail to remind us later, explaining the emblem as "Blood asketh blood" (IV, Chorus, 17).

Within these framed scenic units picturing division is such a precisely ordered arrangement of detail bearing on the theme that Norton and Sackville, for all their concern with dissension, are models of concord in collaboration. The councillors and the Chorus enunciate most explicitly the theme of the divided realm, restating the concept in their several ways. They link division to opposed ideas of age and youth, and love and violence, punning on the meanings of "part" (I, ii, 106, 158-159), "sondred" (I, ii, 112), and "sondrie" (I, ii, 175), and even on the sounds of words like "planting" and "plyant" (I, ii, 313, 316). Each speaker embroiders the theme with imagery to express his own notions about divisiveness. Arosto argues:

> Firste when you shall unlode your aged mynde
> Of hevye care and troubles manifolde,
> And laye the same upon my Lordes your sonnes,
> Whose growing yeres may beare the burden long,
> . . . . . . . . . . .
> Your age in quiet shall the longer last.
> Your lasting age shalbe their longer stay,
> For cares of kynges, . . .
> Do wast mannes lyfe, and hasten crooked age,
> With furrowed face and with enfeebled lymmes,
> To draw on creepyng death a swifter pace.
> They two yet yong shall beare the parted reigne
> With greater ease, than one, now olde, alone. . . .
> (I, ii, 90-107)

Philander, who has a knack for paradoxes, contends that

> . . . whan the region is divided so,
> That brethren be the lordes of either parte,
> Such strength doth nature knit betwene them both,
> In sondrie bodies by conjoyned love,
> That not as two, but one of doubled force,
> Eche to the other as a sure defence.
> The noblenesse and glory of the one
> Doth sharpe the courage of the others mynde,
> With vertuous envie to contende for praise.
> (I, ii, 172-180)

Otherwise, nature may raise up "a grudginge grief, / In yonger brethren at the elders state," a grief whereby

> . . . both townes and kingdomes have ben rased,
> And famous stockes of royall bloud destroied:
> The brother, that shoulde be the brothers aide,
> . . . . . . . . . . . .
> Gapes for his death. . .
> . . . . . . . . . . . .
> And oft impacient of so longe delayes,
> With hatefull slaughter he preventes the fates. . . .
> (I, ii, 190-197)

Eubulus gives the subject an emblematic expression: "Divided reignes do make divided hartes" (260). He joins the imagery of love and violence, and of youth and age with the imagined spectacle of fire, first asking:

> But how much Brittish bloud hath since bene spilt,
> To joyne againe the sondred unitie?
> What princes slaine before their timely houre?
> What wast of townes and people in the lande?
> (I, ii, 275-278)

and then declaring:

> If flatterie then, which fayles not to assaile
> The tendre mindes of yet unskilfull youth,
> In one shall kindle and encrease disdaine,
> And envie in the others harte enflame,
> This fire shall waste their love, their lives, their land,
> And ruthefull ruine shall destroy them both.
> (I, ii, 291-296)

All lead to the destruction of the commonweale:

> And if ambition and inflamed disdaine
> Shall arme the one, the other, or them both,
> To civill warre, or to usurping pride,
> Late shall you rue, that you ne recked before.
> (I, ii, 318-321)

He ends with a favourite image:

> To soone he clambe into the flaming carre,
> Whose want of skill did set the earth on fire,
> (I, ii, 330-331)

which the Chorus soon picks up, along with puns of divisiveness and images already displayed with other shadings:

> Oft tender minde that leades the parciall eye
> Of erring parentes in their childrens love,
> Destroyes the wrongly loved childe therby.
> This doth the proude sonne of Apollo prove,
> Who rasshely set in chariot of his sire,
> Inflamed the parched earth with heavens fire.
> (I, Chorus, 13-18)

Imagery in the speeches of other characters expands these ideas further, and introduces additional variations on the division theme. For example, Porrex's first defense before his father is his description of his unseen grief. It is a murky piece of language expressive of a division between his inner and outer self:

Oh would it mought as full appeare to sight
As inward griefe doth poure it forth to me.
. . . . . . . . . . . .
But as the water troubled with the mudde
Shewes not the face which els the eye should see.
Even so your irefull minde with stirred thought,
Can not so perfectly discerne my cause.
(IV, ii, 38-51)

Paradoxically, Porrex protests a concord between his heart and tongue. But he wants eloquence. His father can imagine none of the "melting tears" he describes. In his second defense, Porrex handles the same theme more convincingly, describing unstaged scenes to argue the division between appearance and reality in his brother's cloak-and-dagger devices, in contrast with his own supposedly loving disposition. Porrex now laces his speech with the imagery of the councillors' arguments. He sought his brother's good will, he asserts,

Hoping my earnest sute should soone have wonne
A loving hart within a brothers brest.
(IV, ii, 97-98)

But the knot of love came "unknitte":

. . . those envious sparkes which erst lay raked
In living cinders of dissembling brest,
Kindled so farre within his hart disdaine,
That longer could he not refraine from proofe
Of secrete practise to deprive me life
By poysons force, and had bereft me so,
If mine owne servant hired to this fact
And moved by trouth with hate to worke the same,
In time had not bewrayed it unto me.
. . . . . . . . . .

> Then saw I how he smiled with slaying knife
> Wrapped under cloke, then saw I depe deceite
> Lurke in his face and death prepared for me.
> (IV, ii, 107-124)

The king, who cannot bring himself to execute his other son, banishes him instead.

Separations compound, in deceit, in banishment, and in death. Videna's suicidal soliloquy (IV, i), whether regarded as heightened language or as the description of the strange furnishings of her mind, is a treatment in words of still other strands of the principal theme, the violent separation of a victim from his life and a child from the womb. Here she curses Porrex:

> Or if nought els but death and bloud of man
> Mought please thy lust, could none in Brittaine land,
> Whose hart betorne out of his panting brest
> With thine owne hand, or worke what death thou wouldest,
> Suffice to make a sacrifice to peaze
> That deadly minde and murderous thought in thee?
> But he who in the selfe same wombe was wrapped,
> Where thou in dismall hower receivedst life?
> (IV, i, 45-52)

And again:

> Never, O wretch, this wombe conceived thee,
> Nor never bode I painfull throwes for thee.
> Changeling to me thou art, and not my childe,
> . . . . . . . . . . .
> Thou never suckt the milke of womans brest,
> But from thy birth the cruell Tigers teates
> Have nursed thee. . .
> (IV, i, 67-73)

Marcella, picturing the ghost forsaking Porrex's body in a passage quoted already, takes these variations of the division theme to an extreme. And, her report of unstaged scenes also provides a glimpse of the gallant prince in bravery, so that the parting with his life may seem more poignant:

> . . . how oft have I behelde
> Thee mounted on thy fierce and traumpling stede,
> Shining in armour bright before the tilt.
> (IV, ii, 248-250)

Marcella seems visibly to shed the kind of tears that Porrex could not show.

Such are a few of the impressive consequences imputed to the wilful foolishness of old King Gorboduc when he divides his kingdom between his sons and retires before his time. But poets endowed with greater gifts than Norton and Sackville could dramatize royalty's affairs with a fine subtlety that makes Gorboduc, rich as it is, seem almost simple by comparison. A poet of superior artistry composed The Wars of Cyrus, a play printed in 1594, but thought to have been staged fifteen years earlier. An examination of this play brings us nearer the final goal, demonstrating that the portrayal of a princely figure as a performer was a recurring interest of Tudor dramatists.

Because so much of the action alternates between two contrasted royal states, the staging arrangements of The Wars of Cyrus are an example of "simultaneous staging" reminiscent of Ludus Coventriae.[3] On the one hand is the war camp of Cyrus, King of Persia, and on the other, the throne room of Antiochus, reigning in Babylon under siege. The grouped tents and pavilions of Cyrus, balanced with Antiochus's inner sanctum, encourage the comparison of the two princes as good and bad. In fact, both kings are pagans, but the way others speak of them seems to define them along simple moral lines. The "Archtyrant," Antiochus, has "endlesse markes of villanie and blood" (524). But Cyrus, the besieger, is "milde, lovely, vertuous, wise and bountifull" (1166).

Between these two warring princes, but in Antiochus's territory, is a castle, symbol of the domains of Gobrias, a wealthy Babylonian who joins Cyrus early in the play. A poplar tree marks the bank of a river separating the Persian armies from the town. The two magnificent kings never cross this boundary to engage each other in sight of the audience, but the Euphrates supports a brisk traffic of deserters, traitors, spies, and double-spies, who come and go between the courts. The river is also the site of acts of passion: love-making, a murder, and a suicide. It is the escape route of a princess and her page, disguised in each other's clothes.

The atmosphere of deception and passion along the "frontier" belies the simplicity of both the symmetrical stage set and the rulers' moral nature. In addition, the scenes in Cyrus's camp are much longer than those in Babylon, and contain more episodes. Although he never appears outside his camp, and certainly never ventures near the river, Cyrus is repeatedly in and out of sight. Antiochus's appearances are brief: he is stationary in his state; makes a foray on the castle, where he captures the wrong person; and, later, passes to the river to find his trusted captain slain. Each time, attention promptly returns to Cyrus, who seems to surround the well-stocked Assyrian redoubt because we see so much of him.

In this way, the play imitates the feeling of a siege, contributing to the impression of Cyrus as a dynamic force always on the move. He is a disciplined, vigorous figure, alert to the comings and goings in his camp, while his opponent is hemmed in, and constricted. The waiting Persian king bides time across the river until his prey persuades himself to leave the citadel to fight. Antiochus is not just Cyrus's moral opposite. He is the victim, making the mistakes that spell his doom.

The conduct of the siege allows Cyrus to dominate the play. Moreover, patterns of action and speech within the fundamental moral dichotomy of stage set and spoken testimonials furnish details about him which contradict his apparent "character" as a version of the Christian Prince, details which imply that this king is, in his moral nature, an equivocal personality.

One side of Cyrus emerges as he deals with the characters who cross the river seeking his protection. Gobrias and Ctesiphon, two deserters from Babylon, purvey stories of remarkable similarity: the Assyrian king has done violence to a son or daughter (I, 2, 206-251; II, 3, 527-559). While Cyrus affects to accept their tales, he treats these two differently, using each deserter according to the decorum he displays. Gobrias is "haughtie minded," accustomed to the "ample stile" (I, 2, 192). Ctesiphon is so obsequious that Cyrus tersely orders him to

> Discend unto the purpose of thy tale,
> And make thy state and fortune plaine at once.
> (II, 3, 525-526)

The king invites Gobrias to frolic in his tent (I, 2, 272-274). The other he makes an unwitting decoy, sending him to a useful death in Babylon (IV, 2). The king's estimate of these two is astute. His handling of them brings him closer to victory over Antiochus, who, because he cannot tell one kind of man from another, gives his battle strategy away.

The dramatist has more fully articulated Cyrus by contraposing him with the Queen of Susa. Her traits point to their elusive opposites in the king, bringing him into focus as an exploiter of other mortals' lives. Cyrus, powerful and controlled, and Panthea, winsome, brave, and mournful, are visible contrasts in their strength and weakness.

But king and captive queen are also deceptively alike in that each is a model of virtue. Panthea figures female virtue under assault, passionately defending her honour and her chastity. When she complains to Cyrus of Araspas's importunities, she pictures her predicament in the imagery of warfare reflecting the dramatic conflict of the play:

> A tedious siege (God knowes) I have endurde,
> More hedious unto me then hastie armes,
> While vilde Araspas with his lewde desires
> Ceaseless solicited by unlawfull bed[.]
> [With stout] repulses I have quailed his hope,
> Which he renued with charge of fresh assaults.
> (IV, 1, 1012-1017)

About Cyrus's virtues, his vassals cannot say enough:

> Histaspis. . . . when I looke into the life,
> The maners, deeds, and qualities of minde,
> The graveness, power, and imperiall parts
> Wherewith yong Cyrus is so full adornde,
> My thoughts foresee that he is ordained of God
> To enlarge the limits of the Persian raigne.

Chrisantas. . . . rare it is to see those yeeres
So furnished with such rare experience
As is not common in the grayest haires.

Histaspis. And of the sundry vertues that abounds,
Dayly increasing in [his] princely breast,
Religion to the gods exceedes them all.
(II, 3, 482-497)

In truth, the king seems to demonstrate nearly everything others claim for him. But his kind of goodness is the Neo-Stoic virtu of the commander in the field, the politic prince Machiavelli described in his famous Art of War.[4] For him, the conventional virtues -- Panthea's sort -- are expediencies.[5] His "goodness" brings him victory, not the tragedy that comes to her. When personages of certain estate lament, as Gobrias and Panthea do, Cyrus "cannot chuse but weepe for companie" (I, 2, 223). The king's chastity is such that he places Panthea in care of a vassal he knows is enamoured of her. Cyrus's show of honour to his enemy persuades Antiochus to accept a "genuine" spy unquestioningly. Cyrus is also the very master of chance that Panthea is not (I, 1, 45), arranging useful marriages and choosing valiant leaders in lotteries (IV, 1, 1135-1157; V, 2, 1539-1536).

The king's demonstrations of virtue and compassion, his indifference to the turns of luck, repay him well. Gobrias, with his wealth and holdings, subtracts himself from Antiochus's sway to furnish the Persian King with men and money. So also comes Abradates, who, in gratitude for Panthea's protection, brings two thousand horse for Cyrus' war. Whatever happens -- Panthea's capture, Araspas's assault on her virtue, or the chance that wins

Abradates the hero's role -- all seems to fall in Cyrus's favour. Like an artist, he molds his fortune out of the matter at hand, shaping his raw human matter as he finds it.[6]

With the King of Persia looming large in front -- counterbalanced by the weaker figures of Panthea and Antiochus -- the play's action and spectacle serve as the middle-ground for a poetic drama of much wider scope, displaying the true dimensions of Cyrus as warrior king. The language enriching the speeches in the Persian camp creates a vast imaginary landscape, filled with the glitter of weaponry, the massed machinery of war. In this larger scene, evoked entirely by poetry, one image especially animates the invisible spectacle fitting for the grandeur, the power, and the ruthlessness of the Persian king. Talk of horses evokes the great theatre in which Cyrus performs, the one in which the Queen of Susa's personal tragedy is reduced to a minor episode in a monstrous clash of human will and bestial force.

The assembly of the imaginary cavalry is subject to Cyrus's manipulation. The king's interest in horses begins with his gift to Chrisantas, a vassal who admires horses as fervently as Araspas adores the Queen. Knowing how to manage the passions of others, Cyrus can afford to be generous. In the bargain, he whets Chrisantas's appetite for glory:

> But of two hundred horses of mine owne,
> Of gallant rase and courage singular,
> Take you the choise, and the furniture withall;
> The bridles bit of massie silver wrought,
> The bosses golde, the reynes of Persian silke,
> The saddles all embrodered purple worke,
> Armde through with plates, with fine ingraven golde,
> And golden trappers dangling to the ground.
> (I, i, 29-36)

When Antiochus gives away a horse, he scants the poetry of the occasion:

> I give thee, to, this sword, armour, and horse,
> A horse as fierce as proude Bucephalus,
> Armour of trustier proofe then Thetis found.
> Therefore, Araspas, fight couragiouslie.
> (V, i, 1412-1417)

But instead of fighting courageously, Araspas hies back to the Persian camp with a report of Antiochus' splendid but unwieldy battle order:

> And thus in order lies his noble campe:
> The forefront is ten [thousand] chariots,
> Of purpose to disranke the approching fo.
> Next them are fiftie thousand horsmen placde,
> To breake in where the chariots breake the way;
> Next them five thousand slaves, being lightly [arm'd,]
> Laden with speares, helmet[s], naked swordes,
> To go along to serve the horsmens use.
> Then twentie thousand Scythians runagates
> With venomde darts, whose heades are tipt with steele;
> And last, the battell of th' Assyrians,
> Being hedgde with launces, as a wood with Briers,
> [Over] whose heades the crossebowes and the slings
> Will shoote and throw bullets of massie yron,
> Whose verie fall would strike [a Cyclops] downe;
> In middest whereof Antiochus will march,
> Before whom dce a thousand bondmen draw
> A brazen wall built upon turning wheles,
> To gard him sure and his concubine.
> (V, ii, 1515-1533)

A few moments earlier, Cyrus had quietly waited out Abradates's impassioned harangue about his horses. Once on the subject, Abradates cannot seem to stop:

> Our horses, which are grasing on the plaine,
> In winter gallops [over] Isie seas,
> And in the sommer swimmes the deepest streames;
> Swifter are they in pace then lightfoot Hart,
> Surer they are then Cammels [p] lodding on the wayes,
> Fiercer then Tygres. . .
> . . . . . . . . . . .

> And if they were compast with arming pikes
> They knew which way to make their passage forth;
> And when their sides is painted eke with blood,
> They pull their reines, and lookes downe to the ground
> As if they vaunted of their service done;
> The rider being dismounted, they stand still
> And kneele upon the ground to take him up,
> But if he chaunce to die, they pine to death.
> (V, i, 1465-1476)

Cyrus listens sympathetically. The cavalry, despite its limitations, has a use, perhaps: to present an awesome spectacle, or to throw confusion in the ranks. He encourages his new ally, albeit hypocritically:

> These horses thou speakest of makes me glorie more
> Then Lydian Cressus in his heapes of gold,
> And of them all doth Cyrus make account
> As of the strengthes and sinewes of the warre.
> (V, i, 1465-1476)[7]

Abradates gladly assumes the magnificent, if suicidal, task of plunging into the mass of chariots and horsemen which Antiochus has unwisely spread in the fore of his army (V, i, 1516-1519). On horseback, Abradates meets a hero's end, cutting down Egyptians in swathes. At least, that is the report of the captain back at camp who describes the scene which, naturally, cannot be staged. Poor Panthea kills herself in grief for loss of her love for whom she has remained virtuous and chaste.

In the end the King of Persia is shown in all his magnanimity and glory, still the apparent model of the ordinary virtues which conventions of dramaturgy and language encourage us to see. But his traditional morality, contradicted by other patterns of speech and scene, makes him, beside the disinterested morality of Panthea, the mirror of the Machiavellian prince.

We get no report of Cyrus's doings during the glorious slaughter. All we know is that he won the war and others died. In a splendid funeral oration, the king pictures an appropriate "shew of mourning" for the dead. Besides the monuments of "fatall E[b]onie, / Of Cedar, Marble, Jet, and during brasses" which Cyrus says will honour Panthea and Abradates, besides the heaps of cattle slain, there will be horses, symbols of bestial passion:

> Twelve thousand horse, being manned each one,
> Trapt all in blacke, shall goe before thy hearse.
> (V, iii, 1690-1691)

He adds:

> Such honour as you both receyvde in life,
> Such honour shall you both receive in death.
> (V, iii, 1696-1697)

Cyrus' speech is thus touched with the cruel and obscure irony characteristic of the magnanimous and glorious prince who benefits from others' passions. Himself devoid of passion, and only simulating its effects, he can be generous with words. With his gift of eloquence he creates a spectacle in language to reward the unlucky and unsuspecting mortals who served him out of gratitude for what they thought, in him, was purely good.

This portrait of the King of Persia renders him nearly inscrutable as he plays a role much like a traditional Christian Prince. The most obvious statements in scenic design and language insist upon his apparent goodness. But the drama's more subtle patterns of scene and speech contrast him with the virtuous Queen of Susa in such a way that we apprehend his personality as an actor, one whose show of goodness masks a calculating mind.

With Cyrus's triumphant performance, we end the survey of techniques of dramatizing royalty in Tudor drama. In the next chapter we shall examine four fresh examples of king plays, dramas in which the playwrights portrayed the Actor King.

# Chapter VIII

A promised objective of this study of Tudor playwrights' techniques of portraying kings was to be the consideration of the theme of the Actor King as expressed in Tudor royal drama. That theme was to provide a possible conceptual principle appropriate for the thought and the art of the times, one that might link several authors of Tudor king plays, regardless of the time and circumstances in which they flourished.

The Introduction quoted the observations of Professor Winny and Mrs. Righter, who argue that the idea of the king as a player is a governing idea in Shakespeare's king plays. Both writers arrived at their conclusions mainly through a consideration of the poetic texture of Shakespearean drama, although Mrs. Righter examined other Tudor plays as well. But it was in studying Shakespeare's Richard III that critics found the theme of the actor king in the first place. The late Professor Rossiter recalled that J. Middleton Murry, a critic of an earlier generation, also was impressed by Shakespeare's theatrical metaphors, and had remarked on the concept of Richard as an actor.[1] Professor Murry had said:

> The predominance of theatrical metaphor in the play no doubt derives in part from the "naive" presentation of Richard III himself. He is conceived as a hypocrite, in the etymological sense--an actor, who is careful to take the audience behind the scenes before he makes his appearance on the stage.[2]

The source of Richard III's dramatic unity, and of the characterization of its king, Professor Rossiter points out, is an over-all system of paradox, the idea that the false is more attractive than the true:

> It is revealed as a constant displaying of inversions, or reversals of meaning: whether we consider the verbal patterns (the peripeteias or reversals of act and intention or expectation); the antithesis of false and true in the histrionic character; or the constant inversions of irony. Those verbal capsizings. . . with their deliberate reversals to the opposite meaning in equivocal terms, are the exact correlatives of both the nature of man (or man in power: Richard) and of the nature of events (history); and of language too, in which all is conveyed.[3]

He adds that the outcome of a conflict of myths, the orthodox Tudor myth with that of Richard the Devil-King, is

> . . . two systems of meaning which impinge and go over to their opposites. . . . This applies equally to words and word-patterns; to the actor-nature; to dramatic ironies; and to events, as the hatch and brood of time, contrasted with opposite expectations.

From an elaborately patterned play, one with scenes so exactly paralleled that they seem deliberately unrealistic, arises the spectacle of king as actor, "the talented being," Professor Rossiter explains, "who can assume every mood and passion at will. . . making others believe in it:"

> The specific interest here is the power that would be in the hands of an actor consummate enough to make. . . "all the world a stage" and to work on humanity by the perfect simulation of every feeling: the appropriate delivery of every word and phrase that will serve his immediate purpose; together with the complete dissimulation of everything that might betray him (whether it be his intentions, or such obstructive feelings as compunction, pity, or uncertainty of mind).[4]

Professor Rossiter might almost have been describing the portrayal of royalty found in The Wars of Cyrus which we were examining at the end of Chapter VII. We stress almost, because, while Cyrus is a good deal like Shakespeare's Richard, and while Cyrus's creator used some conventions and techniques of dramatic characterization in common with Shakespeare's, still the Persian king, as a magnificent princely performer, is conceived without Shakespeare's range and depth of imagination. The Royal Chapel dramatist lacked the gigantic sense of humour; the restraint, delicacy, and moral subtlety in exploiting pathos. Most important, he lacked the greater poet's simultaneous detachment from and self-commitment to his stage character. Without this last, the audience may not see the relevance of an Actor King to themselves as aspiring creatures. Cyrus's creator stands apart from his Cyrus, as he stands apart from his other princely personae, and as the audience must stand apart from these royal figures while assessing them.

Nevertheless, Cyrus is only one of a number of royal characters in Tudor drama who are similar to Shakespeare's Richard insofar as they are portrayed as being, in some sense, actors, that is, characters who demonstrate the dramatic role that royalty plays. The Richard of The True Tragedy of Richard the Third, mentioned often before, is another of the Tudor king figures who plainly conveys the sense of royalty's affairs as being a performance.

In addition to these two royal figures who are plainly characterized as performers, we have frequently encountered in the course of this study devices expressing the ideas of imitation, pretense, deception. Shams, disguises, impostures, poses, and hidden motives, noticed along the way, all bear either on the characterization of royalty or on those special personae who, treated like princes, sometimes determine the "character" of regular stage kings, and sometimes are imitated by them. So also do the devices of mock kingly regalia, and the treatment of royal affairs as a game or sport apply to our theme. The frequency with which Tudor playwrights involved princely characters and their associates in situations of pretense and show makes those notions unavoidably noticeable, even in a general study such as this one has been up to now, of techniques of constructing a royal "character" or "personality" for the stage.

The large cluster of ideas referring expressly to the semblances of reality in lieu of things which are genuine, overlaps with the idea of the king as an actor. These ideas indicate the dramatists' awareness, their potential interest in the simulations and visible display which mark the kingly role. But during our business of illustrating the techniques of royal characterization practiced by Tudor dramatists, these notions have, so far, not been of primary interest, although the objective of the thesis is to show how such techniques could express the idea of the Actor King as the underlying theme of royal characterization in many Tudor plays. Our procedure of first defining and illustrating techniques and conventions leading to a general appreciation of the Tudor art of royal portraiture in drama, before approaching this chosen concept more directly, has kept peripheral until now ideas related to the subject of the Actor King as an object of royal portraiture on the Tudor stage.

Now we can take up the theme of the Actor King in earnest, and with it the tributary notions of sham, show, pretense, and so on, which have come to attention repeatedly. Here, we shall examine four plays, none of them mentioned previously in this thesis. They will furnish examples of how Tudor playwrights made use of the techniques we have examined, but only as they specifically employed them to project royal characters as actors or counterfeiters. With this fresh group of dramas, the devices of imitation, show, and deception become relevant in their own right, contributing as they do to the idea of the Actor King.

The first illustration of the theme of the Actor King is the Herod of York's civic cycle, a drama which, like Ludus Coventriae and The Chester Plays, is a version of the Christian epic of salvation, and, also like them, is of ancient and obscure origins.[5] Although York's two Herods represent two different historical kings made morally akin through the dichotomous organization of the drama's characters, we shall treat them as one figure because the York dramatists, more pointedly than the dramatists of Ludus Coventriae and The Chester Plays, handled the "character" of the second Herod as a further development of the first.

The moral dichotomy of the drama makes York's Herod, in company with the Herods of Ludus Coventriae and The Chester Plays, a wicked king for much the same reasons and through much the same dramatic techniques. Although the techniques of his moral characterization, if elaborated here, would repeat much already described, they form the background against which the dramatists have displayed Herod's character as a performer.

The pretensions of York's Herod begin with his opening speech in the Mason's standard version of him as the gesticulating tyrant of the Nativity episodes. In his ludicrous attempt to imitate the heightened language of Deus in the Creation pageants (i, 1-16; II, 20; III, 5-8), he scrambles the pagan deities with the names of the celestial bodies supposedly under his dominion so that, much more explicitly than the Herod of the Coventry Shearmen and Taylors' pageant, he comes off for the moment with the social character of a necromantic charlatan:

> The clowdes clapped in clerenes þat þer clematis in-closis,
> Jubiter and Jovis, Martis & Mercury emyde,
> Raykand overe my rialte on raw me rejoyses,
> Blonderande þer blastis, to blaw when I bidde.
> Saturne my subgett, þat sotilly is hidde,
> I list at my likyng and laies hym full lowe;
> . . . . . . . . . . .
> Venus his voice to me awe
> Þat princes to play in hym pikis.
> (XVI, 1-11)[6]

Then, gloating about his beauty in words echoing Lucifer's boasts (I, 49-56, 65-72, 81-82), he garbles the imagery of luminousness so that it reinforces the scenic effect of his red mask connoting Wrath:

> Lordis and ladis loo luffely me lithes,
> For I am fairer of face and fressher on folde
> (Þe soth yf I saie sall) sevene and sexti sithis,
> Þan glorius gulles þat gayer [is] þan golde
> in price;
> How thynke þe þer tales þat I talde,
> I am worthy, witty, and wyse! (XVI, 16-22)

The dramaturgical design of the two Nativity pageants in which he figures establishes that King Herod has none of the powers he pretends to, nor even the emotional consistency his mask denotes. In The Coming of the Three Kings to Herod (XVI with XVII) and the Massacre of the Innocents (XIX), his assertions of supremacy are desperate make-believe. Actually, Herod is the creature of his retinue.

The basis of Herod's characterization as a poor performer is in the king-in-state tableaux which his counsellors are at pains to compose by alternately calming the king down and shoring up his morale. Herod's knights protectively maintain the show of royal decorum with flattery and avowals of support by force:

i Miles. All kynges to youre croune may clerly comende
Youre lawe and youre lordshippe as lodsterne on hight,
What traytoure un-trewe þat will not attende,
Ȝe sall lay þaim full lowe, for leem and fro light.

ii Miles. What faitoure, in faithe, þat dose ȝou offende,
We sall sette hym full sore, þat sotte, in youre sight.
(XVI, 23-28)

The carefully posed picture of majesty falls apart when messengers or visitors enter with bad news provoking the king into fits of rage:

Kyng! in þe devyl way, dogges, Fy!
Now I se wele þe roþe and rave.
Be ony skymeryng of the skye
When ȝe shulde knaw owthir kyng or knave?
Nay, I am kyng and non but I.
(XVII, 121-125)

But this Herod is also a specimen of the mixed or wavering mind. His helpless despair contradicts the tantrums which pass for the tyrant's style:

Alas! for sorowe and sighte,
My woo no wighte may wryte,
What devell is best to do.
(XIX, 136-138)

His claims to wit and wisdom notwithstanding, the king is simple-minded, if not deranged. His authority is fake. The semblance of a formal royal court often deteriorates into a huddle, where, in stagey "asides," the courtiers feed Herod advice, correct his behaviour, and insinuate wicked schemes into his empty mind:

My lorde, be ȝe no-thyng a-bast,
Þis bryge shall well to ende be broght,
Bidde þam go furthe and frendly frast
Þe soth of þis þat þei have soght,
And telle it ȝou; so shall ȝe trast
Whedir þer tales be trew or noght.

Than shall we wayte þam with a wrest,
And make all wast þat þei have wroght.

(XVII, 181-188)

The king docilely agrees to whatever his unprincipled underlings suggest. As if pretending to be a tyrant were not task enough for his feeble talents, he eagerly undertakes the role of the courteous king as a device to trap the Magi. He hastens to dress more richly to receive them, and orders a show of hospitality befitting a royal host (XVII, 91-96). It is a role in which he needs some prompting (XVII, 137-142, 181-188). Even when the strategem fails, the deluded king continues to depend upon his counsellors' bad advice. He admires their "sotille trayne" (XVII, 205). He seizes upon their idea of the Massacre, a plan concocted to cheer him up after the collapse of the plot against the Magi. Stupid as he is, Herod senses his inadequacies in playing the part of a ruler. "This halde I gud counsaill," he says, "Yitt wolde I no man wist (XVII, 213-214).

When he appears in the Passion episodes, the doltish tyrant is still the Actor King. Again his sovereignty proves a sham. Again he indulges in play-acting for the pleasure of the game. The basis of these facets of his "character" as a performer is still the king-in-state tableau, modified by configurations of action involving the king with his courtiers and other personae.

The transformation of Herod's state into a court-of-judgment for the trial of Jesus gives the king a better chance to display his taste for pretense as a sporting affair. The trial scene over which he presides evolves further into a playlet in which the king capriciously sets about teaching the prisoner how to perform as royalty, because:

. . . dredeles with-outen any doute
He knawes not þe course of a kyng. . . .
(XXXI, 181)

He pretends to offer Jesus the courtesies one king owes another:

But he schalle sitte be my-selfe. . . ,
Comes nerre, kyng, into courte, saie can ȝe not knele?
We schalle have gaudis full goode and games or we goo.
Howe likis þa? wele, lorde? saie, . . .
(XXXI, 228-231)

He shouts at the prisoner in Latin and French (XXXI, 232-237, 252-253), shoves a mock scepter at him, and bids his courtiers pretend to worship him:

Mi menne, ȝe go menske hym with mayne,
And loke yhow þat it wolde seme.
(XXXI, 254-255)

Herod's show, a grimly playful accompaniment to his brutal questioning, ends suddenly and violently. Enraged by Jesus' silence, the king drops his new-found role, and lapses into an old one, the tyrant. He attacks the prisoner (277). The knights, now that they are elevated to the rank of dukes, are anxious to preserve appearances. They restrain him:

ii. Dux. A! leves lorde!
. . . . . . . . . . .
i. Dux. Now goode lorde and ye may meve you nomore,
Itt is not faire to feght with a fonned foode,
But gose to youre counsaille and comforte you ere.
(XXXI, 278-282)

Muttering, the king retires to his state and pulls himself together, as a new configuration of action evolves before him. The dukes and two princes take over the game of tormenting the prisoner, dressing him as a king of fools. Herod remains a spectator for the time being, intervening from the sidelines to urge the others on, or to relay advice from his counsellors. But his visible lapse from decorum has been sufficient to identify the king as one of a kind with the brutes who are his inferiors, those who now surround Jesus. Herod's royal robes are merely a disguise for another ruffian.

York's Herod also belongs to another circle of villains surrounding Jesus, one which additionally reveals the king's sovereignty as a fraud. Repeated tableaux, movements and actions, and emblematic scenic devices in separate pageant plays link Herod to two magnificos: Pilate, the self-styled philosopher and "perelous prince" (XXVI, 17-19), and Bishop Cayphas, the "pontificall prince of all prestis" (XXX, 207). Pilate and Cayphas vaunt their sovereignty in speeches paralleling Herod's, each claiming supreme power (XXVI, 1-28; XXIX, 1-22; XXX, 1-24; XXXII, 1-28). They, too, have opportunities to threaten the audience, Pilate with a club like the king's (XXX, 3; XXXI, 4; XXXII, 9). Pilate's and Cayphas's pageants are organized, like Herod's, as double tableaux of ruler-in-state and court-of-judgment. Herod has about him his new-made dukes, his counsellors, and his sons, on whom he is servilely dependent. Cayphas is equally dependent upon Anna and a contingent of knights. Even Pilate, the most grandiose and powerful of the lot, has his Beadle, who presumes, in a speech tactfully heightened with poetry, to tell him to send his wife home (XXX, 73-86).

Furthermore, almost identical symbolic configurations of action and emblematic scenic devices enhance the pageants of each of the three would-be rulers. In each pageant, Jesus is baited in game. Door-knocking passages recur, to be echoed later at the gates of Hell (XXXVII). In the three drinking scenes, Herod's duke orders him a drink (XXXI, 36-40); Cayphas slakes his thirst with wine at Anna's suggestion (XXIX, 65-75); and Pilate and his wife have a round of nightcaps before he dismisses her with prolonged farewells (XXX, 91-111).

Finally, the great are displayed in bed. The to-do about getting each of them laid to rest indicates that the York dramatists treated the bed as an opulent scenic device, defining the social "character" of the king as equivalent to the lazy voluptuaries, the bishop and the imperial governor:

Cayph. Do on dayntely, and dress me on dees,
And hendely hille on me happing,
And warne all wightis to be in pees,
For I am late layde unto napping.
(XXIX, 81-84)

Herod needs help from the duke who unlaces him:

Ya, but as þou luffes me hartely,
Laye me doune softely,
For þou wotte full wele
Þat I am full tendirly hydid.
(XXXI, 48-51)

Pilate demands assistance, too:

Have in thy handes hendely and heve me fro hyne,
But loke þat þou tene me not with þi tastyng, but tendirly me touche.
(XXX, 134-135)

It is the repeated imagery of the potentate heaved into bed that conveys the trio's ridiculous weakness as a group of splendid bullies. And we know the king himself better because of his companions in vice.

While the formal parallelism of the many scenic images tightens the equation among the three foes of Jesus, they are also played off as rivals of each other who pass the almost wordless prisoner from court to court. One by one, Cayphas, Pilate, and Herod elude the dangerous business of executing Jesus. Feigning friendship, propriety, and meekness, each sends the prisoner along to rouse the next "judge" out of bed to handle the case. Herod even resigns his own authority to Pilate to rid himself of the responsibility of judging Jesus:

> Repaire with youre present and saie to Pilate,
> We graunte hym oure poure all playne to appere,
> And also oure grevaunce for-geve we algate,
> And we graunte hym oure grace with a good chere.
> (XXXI, 389-392)

However these three -- king, bishop, and Caesar's agent -- have boasted of their awesome power, they contradict their own claims by subserving each other. Their denials of the authority they pretended to possess are admissions that they all are shams.

All the spectacle defining the habits of Herod as one of Jesus' three overblown adversaries is staged to point up similar spectacles in which Jesus figures: the tableaux of the Last Supper (XXVII), and the sleep scene of the Apostles in the Garden of Gethsemane (XXVIII). Jesus is, contrary to the king and his fellow princes, always spartan, awake, and alert. He is the watchful king of whom Erasmus speaks, who must not sleep the whole night.[7] The King of Heaven performs like a true king, but King Herod is a dull-witted, slothful voluptuary pretending to an authority which he and his like-minded associates shuffle about among them.

York's Herod has this characteristic in common with Shakespeare's Actor Kings as Professor Winny describes them: there is a wide disparity between the authoritative performance required of the king, and Herod's personal ability to fill the role assigned to him. He wears the royal costume and sits in the ruler's state; he even attempts some of the "lines" and action considered appropriate for royalty. Although he understands that a degree of pretense is needed for the role, he misses his cues or needs too much prompting to make himself convincing to his audience. Sometimes he overacts his part, only to collapse weakly, not knowing what comes next. When his authority is tested, he evades the issue by cravenly subordinating himself to others' power. Herod proves to be, not just an Actor King, but a bad actor in the bargain.

The principal character in John Skelton's Magnyfycence, a "morality play" dated about 1523,[8] begins and ends his dramatic career as a personified abstraction, but in between times he is much like some ordinary king figures, including Herod. For Magnyfycence, kingliness is a role which must be learned, and for that reason he becomes an example of a Tudor Actor King.

The idea which Magnyfycence personifies is wonderfully elusive. He represents something on the order of princeliness, but also the more general notions of nobleness, dignity, and estate.[9] In the beginning, he belongs with two other abstract figures, Felicity, alias Welthe, and Liberte, who submit with him to the tutelage of still a fourth abstract character, the virtuous and schoolmasterly Measure. At first, Magnyfycence directly asserts only his "noble porte and fame" (165). There is no evidence that he wears royal robes or possesses a crown. All that his retinue consists of are the little company of abstractions, "Convenyent persons for any prynce ryall" (175), who serve him under Measure's counsel. To them, he is "your grace" (173), and a "noble prynce of myght" (168), but these signs of his royalty are only occasional. Among his schoolmates, he is an unassuming and willing scholar.

Skelton has made Magnyfycence the object of an unequal struggle for control between the virtuous Measure and a rascally crew of vices, a variation of the psychomachia which furnishes the drama's plot. Foly, Counterfet Countenaunce, Crafty Conveyaunce, and Courtly Abusyon, led by Clokyd Colusyon as their master "undergroper," oust Measure, and insinuate themselves about Magnyfycence as a retinue of counsellors and favourites in court. Much of the "action" is unstaged, conducted as if out of sight, but Magnyfycence's visible enactment of his new royal role is a turning point of the play.

As Magnyfycence falls into the clutches of his double-dealing friends, his transformation is a reversal of the change in Bale's Kyng Johan. Skelton's figure of royalty lapses into the "character" of a certain kind of king, and the poet-playwright has composed a delightful parody of the Herodian vaunt to display Magnyfycence as he assumes his new "personality," a school-boy imitation of the tyrant.

The changed Magnyfycence begins to act like a king-in-state. "For nowe, syrs," he declares to the audience, "I am lyke as a prynce sholde be" (1475). Even Fortune and the weather submit to him. He compares himself to the great of antiquity, his language heightened by a gleaming image:

> For I am prynce perlesse provyd of porte,
> Bathyd with blysse, embracyd with comforte.
> Syrus, that soleme syar of Babylon,
> That Israell releysyd of theyr captyvyte,
> For all his pompe, for all his ryall trone,
> He may not be comparyd unto me.
> I am the dyamounde dowtlesse of dygnyte.
> (1489-1495)

Suddenly, he has acquired the taste of a dandy, and acts as if he wears a splendid costume:

Porcenya, the prowde provoste of Turky lande,
That ratyd the Romaynes and made them yll rest,
Nor Cesar July, that no man might withstande,
Were never halfe so rychely as I am drest:
No, that I assure you; loke who was the best.
I reyne in my robys, I rule as me lyst.
(1498-1503)

He plainly exhibits himself as a bully: "I drive downe th[e]se dastardys with a dynt of my fyste" (1504). But as a boaster, he is oddly steeped in classical learning, which he shows off in a rather fluent style:

My name is Magnyfycence, man most of myght.
Hercules the herdy, with his stobburn clobbyd mase,
That made Cerberus to cache, the cur dogge of hell,
And Thesius, that prowde was Pluto to face,
It wolde not become them with me for to mell:
For of all barones bolde I bere the bell,
Of all doughty I am doughtyest duke, as I deme;
To me all prynces to lowte man be sene.
(1511-1518)

Soon, he forgets that the object of his speech should be the assertion of his sovereign might, and in the exhibition of his prowess at memorizing history, he pours forth the contents of his schoolboy's brain:

Cherlemayne, that mantenyd the nobles of Fraunce,
Arthur of Albyan, for all his brymme berde,
Nor Basyan the bold, for all his brybaunce,
Nor Alerycus, that rulyd the Gothyaunce by swerd,
. . . . . . . . . . . .
Galba, whom his galantys garde for Agaspe,
Nor Nero. . .
Nor Vaspasyan. . .
Nor Hanyball. . .
Nor yet Cypyo. . . .
(1519-1530)

This procession of formidable challengers, called up from the past with wasps in their noses and running against gates, Magnyfycence would only "frounce on the foretop" (1532) or "flappe. . . as a fole" (1525), punitive measures more appropriate for a schoolmaster than for a sovereign prince.

On the whole, Magnyfycence's first performance as king lacks both force and conviction. His education has been too narrow to make him a convincing tyrant. He has not the right kind of eloquence, nor any substantial vices. But he is teachable, and the bushy-haired dandy, Courtly Abusyon, alias Lusty Pleasure, tutors him now in the art of playing king.

The new schoolmaster enters, "doynge reverence and courtesy" (1532), to begin the task of upgrading Magnyfycence's manner, speech, and tastes in recreation:

> A, syr, your grace me dothe extole and rayse,
> And ferre beyond my merytys ye me commende and prayse;
> Howe be it, I wolde be ryght gladde, I you assure,
> Any thynge to do that myght be to your pleasure.
> (1543-1546)

Such elegance of expression impresses Magnyfycence:

> As I be saved, with pleasure I am supprysyd
> Of your language, it is so well devysed;
> Pullyshyd and fresshe is your ornacy.
> (1547-1549)

Courtly Abusyon then paints the pleasures of "carnall delectacyon," so that his pupil may sharpen his appetite for wanton pleasures becoming to a prince. In language embellished with aureate coinages, the vice images forth a fair mistress, one who

> . . . quyckly is envyved with rudyes of the rose,
> Inpurtured with fetures after your purpose,
> The streynes of her vaynes as asure inde blewe,
> Enbudded with beautye and colour fresshe of hewe,
> As lyly whyte to loke upon her leyre,
> Her eyen relucent as carbuncle so clere,
> Her mouthe enbawmed, dylectable and mery,
> Her lusty lyppes ruddy as the chery:
> Howe lyke you? . . .
> (1569-1577)

Magnyfycence rises to the bait: "A, that were a baby to brace and to basse!. . . / Where myght suche one be founde[illegible]" (1578-1587).

From the point of view of his instructor, the lesson's effect is rewarding. Magnyfycence is soon cursing away, "By cockes armes" and "by Cockes woundes," and attending closely to the fine points of seduction which Courtly Abusyon expounds. Once Magnyfycence has caught the spirit of princely ways, Courtly Abusyon quickly moves on to a more serious topic, the counterfeiting techniques useful to a king:

> And yf you se ony thynge agaynst your mynde,
> Then some occacyon of quarell ye must fynde,
> And frowne it and face it, as thoughe ye wolde fyght,
> Frete yourself for anger and for dyspyte.
> (1618-1620)

Besides making ferocious faces, the vice has a second trick. He explains how Magnyfycence may get rid of a disagreeable supplicant:

> . . . feyne yourselfe dyseased and make yourselfe seke:
> To styre up you stomake you must you forge,
> Call for a candell and cast up your gorge.
> (1631-1633)

To make himself clear, Courtly Abusyon acts out the part the king must play:

> . . . Cockes armes, rest shall I none have
> Tyll I be revenged on that horson knave!
> A, howe my stomake wambleth! I am all in a swete!
> Is there no horson that knave that wyll bete?
> (1635-1638)

So as not to appear an ignoramus, Magnyfycence pretends to be familiar already with such devices:

> For ofte tymes suche a wamblynge goth over my harte;
> Yet I am not harte seke, but that me lyst
> For myrth I have hym coryed, beten, and blyst.
> (1638-1641)

Lessons done, the time comes for Magnyfycence to play his part. No longer the pupil listening to his master, he is now the king-in-court. Feigning obsequiousness, Clokyd Colusyon falls prostrate before him, begging an audience for Measure:

> Please it your grace, at the contemplacyon
> Of my pore instance and supplycacyon,
> Tenderly to consyder in your advertence
> Of our blessyd Lorde, syr, at the reverence,
> Remembre the good servyce that Mesure hath you done,
> And that ye wyll not cast hym away so sone.
> (1652-1657)

But inveigling Magnyfycence to cast away Measure is exactly the object of the vices who plan to rifle the royal coffers. They have planned all before, even quarrelling over the parts each will play to rid the court of their rival. Clokyd Colusyon now prepares Magnyfycence's mind toward his old friend by professing that Measure has been bribing him. Finally, the king affects to consult his councillor, his tutor in dalliance of a moment ago. Courtly Abusyon reassures him. Clokyd Colusyon ushers in the humble Measure, with more bowing and haughty speeches. Measure no sooner begs a hearing than Magnyfycence begins his act, a scene which repeats the rehearsal, but with a different actor in the main role:

> What, woldest thou, lurden, with me brawle agayne?
> Have hym hens, I say, out of my syght;
> That day I se hym, I shall be worse all nyght.
> . . . . . . . . . .
> Alas; my stomake fareth as it wolde cast!
> (1745-1749)

The burst of royal fury and gastronomic unease drives poor Measure out of court, a vice helping him on his way. As he departs, Magnyfycence works up a tantrum famously, one which would have done York's Herod credit. He feigns to brush off the courtier who rushes to his aid:

> A bolle or a basyn, I say, for Goddes brede!
> A, my hede! But is the horson gone?
> God gyve hym a myscheffe! Nay, nowe let me alone.
> (1751-1733)

One of his collaborators in the show covertly congratulates the king: "A good dryfte, syr, a praty fete" (1754).

But once Measure is out of sight, Magnyfycence's contrived wrath does not really subside. The mere mention of his old friend riles him up again: "Measure, tut! what, the devyll of hell!" (1768). Clokyd Colusyon hastens to encourage the king in his passion. The vices have well taught their princely pupil to play the counterfeit tyrant, so well, in fact, that he is now convinced of the genuineness of his feigned emotions. The rascals settle down to the real object of their deceptions, pilling Magnyfycence of his substance, an easy task without Measure's cautionary interference.

Like York's Herod, Skelton's Magnyfycence is easy to recognize as an Actor King. In both instances, the dramatists have made obvious a duplicity of the royal character, so that their performances are transparent pretense. When York's Herod lapses from his show of ferocity and power into the picture of weakness and despair, some of his actions contradict other things he does. When he indulges in make-believe to exercise his cruel sense of humour, the game plainly ends with his sudden change of mood.

But as an Actor King, Magnyfycence is a little closer to the "naive" hypocrite which Professor Murry saw in Shakespeare's Richard III. The moments which take the audience "behind the scenes," when the royal performer learns his part or when one of his cast unmasks to show another face, make impossible a convincing illusion of royal authority and display. Skelton exposes the audience to the contradiction between the royal performance and another "reality." The double perspective on the king figure as an actor is one of the pleasures of Skelton's portrayal of royalty.

York's Herod may be considered an incompetent version of the Actor King, and Skelton's Magnyfycence is clearly an amateur of the greenest sort. We now turn to the drama of a collection of incompetents in the kingly role as they encounter a master of the royal style.

Of all the princely figures in Tudor drama who vaunt the grandeur of their earthly dignity and the supernatural power of their majesty, none is more convincing and appealing than Christopher Marlowe's eloquent, fiery-spirited conqueror, the hero of the two-part drama Tamburlaine, dated about 1587-1588.[10] The dramatic fact of this self-crowned king's convincingness makes him an important majestic character in this study of the Actor King, if only because of his effect on several other royal characters who make traditional kinds of claims to their thrones. We can grasp the nature of these petty kings' pretenses a little better by glancing first at the character who brings about their overthrow.

The base-born shepherd who "came up of nothing" (2, III, ii, 74-75)[11] to be the "Scourge and Wrath of God, / . . . the fear and terror of the world" (1, III, iii, 44-45), Tamburlaine is just beginning to "wean" his state and form a retinue when he first appears on stage (1, I, ii). Already he speaks in the "high astounding terms" which the

Prologue promises (1, Pro., 5), terms which make the similar vaunts of other stage kings seem inarticulate by comparison. "We will triumph over all the world," Tamburlaine declares to his company:

> I hold the Fates bound fast in iron chains,
> And with my hand turn Fortune's wheel about,
> And sooner shall the sun fall from his sphere
> Than Tamburlaine be slain or over come.
> Draw forth thy sword, thou mighty man at arms,
> Intending but to raze my charmed skin,
> And Jove himself will stretch his hand from heaven
> To ward the blow. . . .
> (1, I, ii, 172-180)

He has yet to prove himself to be a personage of any consequence at all, but fates and oracles of heaven, he insists, have sworn to "royalize" his deeds:

> Nor are Apollo's oracles more true
> Than thou shalt find my vaunts substantial.
> (1, I, ii, 211-212)

The "renowmed friends" who form his company see in him the image of potential power:

> As princely lions when they rouse themselves,
> Stretching their paws, and threatening herds of beasts,
> So in armour looketh Tamburlaine.
> (1, I, ii, 52-54)

They have no doubt that the barbarian raider of trade caravans will match his words with deeds.

In time, Tamburlaine brings to pass nearly everything he claims. Wielding the "power of heaven's eternal majesty" (2, IV, i, 158), he conquers kingdoms and empires, destroying armies and cities as he goes. A succession of triumphs brings him captives and spoils, plain for all to see. His tributaries rule Asia and Africa, and begin assaults on Europe, while their commander eyes the southern hemisphere. In sum, Tamburlaine's earthly actions so well conform to his assertions that his career of conquest and bloodshed makes him seem the very antithesis of the Actor Kings described so far. He appears as a man of true majesty whose words invariably speak his mind, and that is his value here.

Marlowe's play exhibits no moral dichotomy of characters in the traditional sense of kings allied with God or Devil. There is only Tamburlaine and those who follow him, against those who try to stand him off. Each group claims true gods as their supporters, Tamburlaine's being the Jove whose name is often on his lips. But Marlowe's characterization of Tamburlaine as a successful majestic hero, convinced himself and convincing others of the spirit investing him with power, allows the Tartar chieftain to be a standard of performance against which to measure the ordinary figures of royalty who meet him and submit. Compared to the single-minded Tamburlaine, established kings and emperors are mere pretenders to their crowns. Their worthiness is unproved, their persons in no wise hallowed, and their claims to birthright honours and divine appointment, patent frauds.

Marlowe dramatizes ordinary royalty as an empty show of might and right which collapses before a challenger who proves himself more worthy, although not born to kingly rank. When the sham potentates encounter the "peremptory customs" of a conqueror impelled by the divine afflatus, they reveal themselves as weak and ineffectual braggarts whose crowns are ripe for picking. "Now," Tamburlaine declares to the captive king, Orcanes:

> Now you shall feel the strength of Tamburlaine,
> And by the state of his supremacy,
> Approve the difference 'twixt himself and you.
> (2, IV, i, 135-137)

To Tamburlaine, captive kings are merely costumed peasants. Stripping them of their names, titles, and dignities, he abuses them as he likes. He treads on an emperor as his footstool when taking his stately seat (1, IV, ii), or whips a pair of petty kings whom he has reduced to beasts of burden (2, IV, iii). In short, he turns upside down the order of the world, and with it, the idea of what royalty is supposed to be and do.

In part, Marlowe's portrayal of the pretentiousness of ordinary kings arises from a dramaturgy presenting established rulers as easy prey for Tamburlaine. Sequences of king-in-council tableaux, parleys between hostile commanders, skirmishes, sieges, and scenes of submission and coronation, mark the dizzy progress of the hero as he fulfills his aspiration to be arch-monarch of the world. Spectacular emblematic scenes of humiliated royalty enhance each of the two plays in the drama. In Part One, the defeated Turkish Emperor curses Tamburlaine from an iron cage dragged from camp to camp. In Part Two, Tamburlaine rides in his chariot drawn by captive kings, an emblematic image associated with turns of fortune in Jocasta's fifth act dumbshow, but now transformed into the "figure" of the hero's dignity as commander of his fate (2, IV, iii, 25). In addition, crowns, as objects of both contempt and honour, change hands almost by the dozen, symbolizing visually the tenuousness of a ruler's claim to state.

But scenic imagery accounts only in a general way for Marlowe's version of the pretensions of royalty. The playwright defines more fully the deceptions of ordinary royalty in the speeches of the individual kings and emperors whom his hero overturns. The portrait of Tamburlaine as an inspired poet defeating princes who lack his special gifts is Marlowe's way of showing that impotence in language means impotence in performing as a king.

The simplest way to appreciate Marlowe's technique of distinguishing his princely personae as different kinds of poor performers of their roles is to examine Tamburlaine's style of speaking to his followers, and compare the style of the other princes as they speak to theirs. Tamburlaine shares his vision with his fellows, making the difficult worth doing:

> Kings of Argier, Moroccus, and of Fesse,
> You that have marched with happy Tamburlaine
> As far as from the frozen place of heaven
> Unto the watery morning's ruddy bower,
> And thence by land unto the torrid zone,
> Deserve these titles I endow you with,
> By valour and by magnanimity.
> Your births shall be no blemish to your fame;
> For virtue is the fount whence honour springs,
> And they are worthy she investeth kings.
> (1, IV, iv, 124-123)

The glory of future conquests belongs to his supporters as well as to him. "Both we," he emphasizes to Theridamas:

> Both we will walk upon the lofty clifts,
> And Christian merchants, that with Russian stems
> Plough up huge furrows in the Caspian Sea,
> Shall vail to us as lords of all the lake
> Both we will reign as consuls of the earth,
> And mighty kings shall be our senators;
> Jove sometimes masked in a shepherd's weed,
> And by those steps that he hath scal'd the heavens,
> May we become immortal like the gods.
> (1, I, ii, 192-196)

Knowing that Nature "Doth teach us all to have aspiring minds" (1, II, vii, 20), Tamburlaine never fails to make a joint enterprise of his ambitions. His words put before the eyes of others the picture of new conquests just ahead, and excite the feeling that all is within their easy reach:

> Now may we see Damascus' lofty towers,
> Like to the shadows of Pryamides
> That with their beauties graced the Memphian fields.
> The golden stature of their feathered bird,
> That spreads her wings upon the city walls,
> Shall not defend it from our battering shot.
> The townsmen mask in silk and cloth of gold,
> And every house is as a treasury;
> The men, the treasure and the town is ours.
> (1, IV, ii, 102-110)

Seated in his state he evokes the impression of the divineness of his majesty in words that soar and carry his company along:

> Now clear the triple region of the air,
> And let the majesty of heaven behold
> Their scourge and terror tread on emperors.
> Smile, stars that reign'd at my nativity,
> And dim the brightness of their neighbour lamps;
> Disdain to borrow light of Cynthia,
> For I, the chiefest lamp of all the earth,
> First rising in the east with mild aspect,
> . . . . . . . . . . .
> Will send up fire to your turning spheres,
> And cause the sun to borrow light of you.
> (1, IV, ii, 30-40)

This exhilarating poetry transforms Tamburlaine into the universal man before the eyes of his companions who share his feelings.[12] Poetic expression is an essential feature of their leader's "personality," the source of his success as conqueror of the world. The actor who portrays him visually images Tamburlaine's special nature with gestures which lift his words and thoughts, along with the spirit of his companions, beyond the realm of the ordinary human scene.

Contrasted with Tamburlaine's success in inspiring his followers to help him act out his visionary plans, the monarchs he defeats illustrate kingly failures in the art of handling words.

Tamburlaine's victims do not possess sufficient powers of expression and imagination to endow their special sovereign status with the appearance of infallibility and truth. In one scene after another, the playwright exhibits his poetic versatility in creating "character" out of language to expose the particular kinds of feebleness of the pretenders who are kings.

Sometimes Marlowe's purpose requires him to imitate bad poetry to display against the best. When the Soldan of Egypt, for example, is apprised of the numbers of Tamburlaine's troops, he indulges in brave talk which soon lapses into images of insignificant and falling things:

> Nay, could their numbers countervail the stars,
> Or ever drizzling drops of April showers
> Or withered leaves that autumn shaketh down,
> Yet would the Soldan by his conquering power
> So scatter and consume them in his rage,
> That not a man should live to rue their fall.
> (1, IV, 1, 31-36)

The Soldan's councillor ends this poetic drift by bringing him up short:

> So might your highness, had you time to sort
> Your fighting men, and raise your royal host.
> (1, IV, 1, 37-38)

Finally made sensible that Tamburlaine has caught him unprepared, the Soldan resorts to mean and spiteful name-calling which exposes him as crude:

> Merciless villain, peasant, ignorant
> Of lawful arms or martial discipline,
> Pillage and murder are his usual trades,
> The slave usurps the glorious name of war!
> (1, IV, 1, 65-68)

Marlowe treats the Emperor of Turkey, he who ends in the iron cage, as a different sort of royal pretender whose speech cannot match his claims. Bajazeth appears in great pomp, uttering speeches significant of his port. The "we" he refers to is nobody but himself:

> We hear the Tartars and the eastern thieves,
> Under the conduct of one Tamburlaine,
> Presume a bickering with your emperor,
> And thinks to rouse us from our dreadful siege
> Of the famous Grecian Contantinople.
> You know our army is invincible. . . .
> (1, III, i, 2-7)

He dispatches a Basso off to Tamburlaine to recite his list of formidable royal titles which are supposed to convince the Scythian that he must cease his annoying raids. "Tush," says Tamburlaine when he hears of Bajazeth's ponderous rumblings:

> . . . Turks are full of brags
> And menace more than they can well perform.
> He meet me in the field and fetch thee hence!
> Alas, poor Turk! his fortune is too weak. . . .
> (1, III, iii, 3-6)

Cosroe, brother of the King of Persia, who hopes to use the shepherd-raider's power to seize the throne, is a more complicated example of royal pretension and deception through language. Marlowe makes his speeches the record of a would-be king's mistakes. When he is wooing Tamburlaine's assistance, Cosroe speaks of the Scythian with patronizing flattery. It is the "valiant" Tamburlaine he seeks. And, thinking poetry appropriate to his friendly feelings for the Scythian as an ally, he adds this strained conceit:

> The man that in the forehead of his fortune
> Bears figures of renown and miracle.
> (1, II, i, 3-4)

But this is as far as Cosroe's poetic fancy can take him. Menaphon, his mouthpiece, must carry on in kind. The councillor concocts a bizarre portrait of Tamburlaine, a mish-mash of voguish imagery appropriate to silly games of love. The shepherd's head, as Menaphon describes it, is

> A pearl more worth than all the world. . . ,
> Wherein by curious sovereignty of art
> Are fixed his piercing instruments of sight
> Whose fiery circles bear encompassed
> A heaven of heavenly bodies in their spheres.
> (1, II, i, 12-16)

Menaphon has portrayed, not Tamburlaine, but some unreal gaudy monster.

By now, however, Cosroe has shifted his interest to the subject of Tamburlaine's power of compelling speech, thinking it a negotiable instrument which can be of use to him. He admires the gift

> That could persuade, at such a sudden pinch,
> With reasons of his valour and his life,
> A thousand sworn and overmatching foes.
> (1, II, i, 37-39)

But Tamburlaine's art, not to mention the spirit behind it, is something that eludes Cosroe forever. When the Tartar chieftain suddenly challenges him to a war, the surprised Persian sees his erstwhile friend anew, as the "image of ingratitude" (1, II, vii, 30). Now Cosroe must exercise his own poor talents to muster a defense. His speech exhorting his troops to battle illustrates the failure of his imagination in using language, a failure which suggests the reason why he lost the crown:

> Resolve, my lords and loving soldiers, now
> To save your king and country from decay.
> Then strike up, drum; and all the stars that make
> The loathsome circle of my dated life,
> Direct my weapon to his barbarous heart,
> That thus opposeth him against the gods,
> And scorns the powers that govern Persia!
> (1, II, vi, 34-40)

Cosroe's pretension that his motives of mean and personal revenge ought to rouse his soldiers' fighting spirit ~~is~~ simply too transparent for them to be convinced.

Finally, Mycetes, the witless King of Persia, is Marlowe's touchstone for the motif of language as the essence of a successful royal show. Another pretender to kingly stature who must rely on underlings to speak his mind, Mycetes so lacks the powers of thought and speech that he cannot rule at all. To him, "'tis a pretty toy to be a poet" (1, II, iii, 4), and he garnishes his incoherent talk with the affectations of a bad poetic style:

> I long to see thee back return from thence,
> That I may view these milk-white steeds of mine
> All loaden with the heads of killed men,
> And from their knees even to their hoofs below
> Besmeared with blood that makes a dainty show.
> (1, I, i, 76-80)

More often, Mycetes is completely inarticulate. "I find myself agriev'd," he complains, "Yet insufficient to express the same" (1, I, i, 1-2). For a "great and thundering speech" he calls for help from others, including his brother. But Cosroe concocts an oration ridiculing the king so obviously that even Mycetes understands.

A second orator, Meander, serves the king a little better, though with long-winded declarations which make his own name a joke. And when it is time to urge the troops to fight, Meander can only muster thoughts in his same pedestrian and moralizing vein, the vein of nursery stories and make-believe:

> Then noble soldiers, to entrap these thieves,
> That live confounded in disordered troops,
> If wealth or riches may prevail with them,
> We have our camels laden all with gold,
> Which you that be but common soldiers
> Shall fling in every corner of the field;
> And while the base-born Tartars take it up,
> You, fighting more for honour than for gold,
> Shall massacre those greedy minded slaves.
> (1, II, iii, 59-67)

Mycetes applauds this laughable strategy:

> He tells you true, my masters, so he does.
> Drums, why sound ye not when Meander speaks?
> (1, II, iii, 74-75)

This is the king who later wanders about the battlefield, looking for a hole in which to hide his precious toy, the crown (1, II, iv). His brainless plan to escape the danger is to disguise himself by pretending not to be a king at all.

Marlowe's individual characterizations of ordinary princes as they are overwhelmed by a majestic figure of extraordinary power adds a new and profound dimension to the expression in Tudor drama of the theme of the Actor King. In illustrating the dramatic role that royalty must play, York's Herod gives a performance that falls short primarily in terms of the spectacle he presents. He is visibly unable to fulfill the role of ruler, although in costume and in "state" he often looks the part. The shortcomings of Skelton's Magnyfycence show that the illusion of a successful kingly performance is largely a matter of action or behaviour as the visible evidence of royal power and princely mind. Had Magnyfycence only heeded better teachers, he would have played his part in more becoming style. But Marlowe's treatment of Tamburlaine's victims as incompetent Actor Kings penetrates to the power essential for maintaining the royal show, the art of handling language to support the spectacle of the prince.

Happily, we can conclude our exploration of the Actor King as a characterization of royalty in Tudor drama with an example of a much higher order of competence on the part of a princely performer than Marlowe allows his unfortunate kings and emperors in Tamburlaine.

Titania, Queen of the Fairies in A Midsummer Night's Dream, furnishes a final illustration appropriate for a study which found a beginning in Shakespeare's royal dramas. Although Titania is an important figure in a complicated play of many exquisite subtleties, only her passion for the ass-headed Bottom is relevant here. Shakespeare has made that episode a charming and witty allegory of a political love affair conducted by an incomparable practitioner of the art of the royal performance.

Although presuming to supernatural powers of her own, the Fairy Queen, like the bemused Athenian lovers in the play, falls under the spell of Oberon's magic potion. She discovers herself in love with a rude weaver, whom Puck's mischief has already transformed into the image of docile stupidity. Titania's strange and transitory infatuation, one of several magically contrived affections which provide the play's dreamlike confusions, has given the Tudor drama what is surely its most delightful tableau scene: the spectacle of the bright-winged fairy ruler entertaining her grotesque love in her bowery court. The scene is the intrinsically theatrical bed-of-state. The Fairy Queen beckons to Bottom:

> Come, sit thee downe upon this flowry bed,
> While I thy amiable cheekes doe coy,
> And sticke muske roses in thy sleeke smoothe head,
> And kisse thy faire large eares, my gentle joy.
> (IV, i, 1511-1514)

The comic configuration of a queenly supernatural being caressing an oaf with the head of an ass is enhanced by the same delicate beauty of dappled shadowy things and of barely perceptible metamorphoses, which Shakespeare's poetic imagery suffuses throughout the play:

I know a banke where the wilde time blowes,
Where Oxslips and the nodding Violet growes,
Quite over-cannoped with luscious woodbine,
With sweet muske roses, and with Eglantine;
There sleepes Tytania, sometime of the night,
Lul'd in these flowers, with dances and delight:
And there the snake throwes her enammel'd skinne,
Weed wide enough to rap a Fairy in. . . .
(II, i, 630-637)

Titania's retinue, Peaseblossom, Cobweb, Moth and Mustardseed, do the queen's ungainly beloved the courtesies proper for entertaining a court favourite. They hail him as a personage of importance, and feed him apricots and dewberries. They scratch his donkey head. Titania croons to him:

Sleepe thou, and I will winde thee in my arms,
Fairies be gone, and be alwaies away.
So doth the woodbine, the sweet Honisuckle,
Gently entwist; the female Ivy so
Enrings the barky fingers of the Elme.
O how I love thee! how I dote on thee!
(IV, i, 1553-1558)

Oberon, peeking at the pair, describes what we are supposed to see: the clumsy artisan whose "transformed scalpe," with its big ears, Titania has wreathed in woodland flowers bejewelled with pearly dew:

Seest thou this sweet sight?
Her dotage now I doe begin to pitty.
For meeting her of late behinde the wood,
Seeking sweet favors for this hatefull foole,
I did upbraid her, and fall out with her.
For she his hairy temples then had rounded,
With coronet of fresh and fragrant flowers.
And that same dew which somtime on the buds,
Was wont to swell like round and orient pearles:
Stood now within the pretty flouriets eyes,
Like teares that did their owne disgrace bewaile.
(IV, i, 1561-1571)

This donkey's particularities of character tell a little more about the kind of passion to which the Fairy Queen succumbs. Only moments before he fell into Titania's embraces, Bottom had been about to play the lover in the rehearsal of the "tedious breefe Scene" of tragical mirth for Duke Theseus's wedding entertainment. Bottom had wanted all the best parts for himself: the lover, the woman, and the lion:

> . . . yet, my chiefe humour is for a tyrant. I could play Ercles rarely, or a part to teare a Cat in, to make all split the raging Rocks; and shivering shocks shall break the locks of prison gates, and Phibbus carre shall shine from farre, and make and marre the foolish Fates. This was lofty. . . . This is Ercles vaine, a tyrants vaine. . . .
>
> (I, ii, 296-301)

As for the lover, "who kills himselfe most gallantly," that role Bottom considers "more condoling" (I, ii, 301-302):

> That will aske some teares in the true performing of it: if I do it, let the audience looke to their eies: I will moove stormes. . . .
>
> (I, ii,. 293-295)

Now he finds himself playing the loved one, and, in time, liking the part rather well. Titania thinks him an angel, and as wise as he is beautiful. She admires his braying song, which he has been singing to keep up his spirits:

> I pray thee gentle mortall, sing againe,
> Mine eare is much enamored of thy note;
> On the first view to say, to sweare I love thee.
> So is mine eye enthralled to thy shape,
> And thy faire vertues force (perforce) doth move me.
>
> (III, i, 954-958)

At first Bottom can find no reason in the Fairy Queen's affection for him. He looks about uneasily for a way out of the enchanted wood -- out of what he knows is madness. But Titania claims him possessively:

> Out of this wood, do not desire to goe,
> Thou shalt remaine here, whether thou wilt or no.
> I am a spirit of no common rate:
> The Summer still doth tend upon my state,
> And I doe love thee; therefore goe with me,
> Ile give thee Fairies to attend on thee;
> And they shall fetch thee Jewels from the deepe,
> And sing, while thou on pressed flowers dost sleepe:
> And I will purge thy mortall grosseness so,
> That thou shalt like an airie spirit go.
> (III, i, 969-978)

The adaptable fellow learns his new part quickly. He reveals himself to be a bit of the voluptuary. Soon he is affecting the mannerisms of an old idler about court, now thinking about consulting his barber, and now ordering delicacies with a fine regard for detail:

> Mounsieur Cobweb, good Mounsier get your weapons in your hand, & kill me a red hipt humble-Bee, on the top of a thistle; and good Mounsieur bring mee the hony bag. Doe not fret yourselfe too much in the action, Mounsieur; and good Mounsieur have a care the hony bag breake not, I would be loth to have yon over-flowne with a hony-bag signiour.
> (IV, i, 1520-1526).

When Oberon releases the Fairy Queen from her spell, she eyes her paramour with horror:

> How came these things to passe?
> Oh, how mine eyes doth loath this visage now !
> (IV, i, 1594-1595)

Bottom can only stammer incoherently at the memory of this lovely dream in which he played a most important role:

> I have had a most rare vision. I had a dreame, past the wit of man, to say, what dreame it was. Man is but an Asse, if he goe about to expound this dreame. Me-thought I was, there is no man can tell what. . . .
> (IV, ii, 1731-1740)

Thus, through the incongruity of the Fairy Queen's captivity in a waking dream of love, Shakespeare has delineated a royal character as an ethereal version of the ordinary mortal. We know her better through the creature she loves. Titania is a queen of supernatural powers enamoured of an unseemly ass, an amateur at acting who yearns for loftier roles. Although she is an unearthly creature, one whose moral type is thoroughly obscure, she seems as subject to human passion and the powers of other beings as were the classical Olympians admired during the Renaissance.

But in addition to the poetry and spectacle which compose this unique portrait of royalty, Shakespeare has rested the characterization of his supernatural queen on the common Tudor dramatic device of the allusion to a living personage outside the show. Her function as an allusion enriches Titania's character with references to semblances of reality staged beyond the boundaries of the play.

In England during the mid-1590s, when Shakespeare is thought to have composed A Midsummer Night's Dream,[13] there was only one Fairy Queen: Queen Elizabeth. The Fairy Queen was a mythological "personality" invented for her by her Master of the Armory, Sir Henry Lee. The device contributed to the spectacular imagery of tilts and tournaments from the earliest years of her reign until the 1590s.[14]

Elizabeth made a personal appearance in the guise of the Fairy Queen in an entertainment at Woodstock in 1575. Then, in 1589, Edmund Spenser presented her with the first three books of his monumental allegorical epic on which he had been working for nearly a decade.[15] His Faerie Queene celebrated England's monarch as a semi-divine figure of moral import. Spenser's poem is set, like A Midsummer Night's Dream, in the border regions where the natural and the supernatural overlap, and its fable is similar to Shakespeare's play in being a romance of dreamlike happenings.

In 1592, Elizabeth, again as the Fairy Queen, took part in an entertainment on progress at Ditchley.[16] There, she passed through an enchanted wood to awaken her old tilt champion from a charmed sleep into which, according to the script of Lee's devising, she had bound him long before. To celebrate the occasion, Lee had Elizabeth's portrait painted, a famous work attributed to Marcus Gheeraerts the Younger. It portrays the aging queen -- she was nearly sixty -- in supernatural splendour as the ruler of faerie, her wings of starched "gossamer" garnished with jewels.[17] This image of her circulated in engraved versions of a drawing prepared by Isaac Oliver.[18] In another painting evoking the magical quality of the Fairy Queen myth, Procession of Elizabeth I, painted about 1600, a train of courtiers carry Elizabeth on a litter through a moonlit landscape.[19]

It is certain, therefore, that many in Shakespeare's audience would have recognized Titania of A Midsummer Night's Dream as an allusion to Queen Elizabeth which incorporated her as a persona in the drama's action. The charming character of Titania, played by a youth trained in the dramatic arts of song, speech and mime, and performed in an atmosphere of poetical enchantment, would have been a compliment to the queen's powers as a royal actress, a mirror of the grace and beauty to which she still pretended as an old lady.

But even as a pleasing image of Elizabeth, which she herself might have enjoyed, the depiction of the Fairy Queen in love might seem an impudence. Yet the Fairy Queen was only one of many mythological epithets of Queen Elizabeth which made her the idol of a love cult. With love letters, tokens, and posies, her courtiers and her suitors paid homage to her as a goddess of beauty, virtue, and truth, and she played to their compliments with artifices of her own. "She is a Princess who can act any part she pleases," the French ambassador once remarked, a bit bitterly, to be sure.[20] Upon the death of the Duke of Alençon, one of her many royal suitors, she even made a show of being a lamenting widow. In his play, Old Fortunatus, Thomas Dekker conveys the institutional nature of the game of the adored and the adoring which the queen encouraged personally:

> Some call her Pandora: some Gloriana: some Cynthia: some Belphoebe: some Astraea; all by several names to express several loves: Yet all those names make but one celestial body, as all those loves meet to create but one soul.[21]

The notions manifested in the cult of Elizabeth as an eternal love goddess -- "the Summer still doth tend upon my state," as Titania says -- found their way into pageantry and painting.[22] Her artists and poets surrounded her with an elaborate system of symbols: the serpent of wisdom, for instance; the moon, an emblem of Cynthia linked with "forces of the mind;" and the eglantine, signifying chastity, often juxtaposed with the rose.[23] All these occur in the passages quoted here from A Midsummer Night's Dream. Love and wisdom were forever a new and springlike magic during Elizabeth's endless summer.

But what of her gross and comical darling? Queen Elizabeth extended her love cult far beyond London and her court. She captured the devotion of the English people at large in the first few months of her reign. Thereafter, as a "human and approachable goddess," she assiduously courted their affection, even while keeping her royal and noble suitors dangling with lovetricks and flattery. Her biographer, J. C. Neale, has written:

> No Prince has been a greater courtier of the people, nor any actress known better how to move her audience to transports of love and admiration. . . . Elizabeth's mind was ever fixed on popular favour, at first as an art of government, and later as a profound emotional satisfaction.[24]

Nearly every year, Elizabeth showed herself to the people of countryside while on progress, her court a moving spectacle of princely "train and power." A speech by Duke Theseus in A Midsummer Night's Dream captures the tone of graciousness with which the queen strove to meet the humble, the fearful, and the tedious:

> Where I have come, great Clearkes have purposed
> To greete me with premeditated welcomes;
> Where I have seene them shiver and looke pale,
> Make periods in the midst of sentences,
> Throttle their practiz'd accent in their feares,
> And in conclusion, dumbly have broke off,
> Not paying me a welcome. Trust me sweete,
> Out of this silence yet, I pickt a welcome:
> And in the modesty of fearefull duty,
> I read as much, as from the ratling tongue
> Of saucy and audacious eloquence.
> Love therefore, and tongue-tide simplicity,
> In least, speake most, to my capacity.
> (V, i, 1890-1902)

Elizabeth kept her people bewitched in a perpetual romance, sustained by eloquence and show. When urged to marry and produce an heir, she staunchly declared that she was married to the kingdom. And so she remained, wed to her countrymen to the end.[25] A Midsummer Night's Dream mischievously reveals the simpleton the queen pretended to adore: Bottom the Weaver, the representative lowly English commoner upon whom the realm depended for its wealth.[26] Compared to her, he is but an amateur at acting, a clumsy spoiler of illusion, although aspiring to play the tyrant's part.

Shakespeare's ambiguous characterization of Titania both compliments and mocks the queen's counterfeited love for the mass of English people, the ignorant but industrious Bottoms at the "bottom" of the social heap, those who do not suspect her skill at amorous games and masquerade. He shows her in the guise of an ethereal lover binding an ambitious dolt to herself in a loving tyranny steeped in magic mists. Although the Fairy Queen's consuming passion for her captive violates the claims of common sense, she maintains the illusion of love so perfectly that she, too, appears the victim of a spell. Transparent though it may be to another artist in illusion, Elizabeth's pretense is convincing to her lowly subjects, despite reason which insists it is not so. By portraying Elizabeth as an imitator of supernatural beings enslaved by her own kind of magic, Shakespeare has paid a handsome tribute to her success and competence as an Actor King. He pretends to take her pretense at face value, while laughing at the comic nonsense of her show.

# Chapter IX

The variations on the theme of the Actor King which animate the portraits of York's Herod, Skelton's Magnyfycence, and the defeated rulers in Marlowe's Tamburlaine are evidence of an abiding concern among Tudor dramatists with the office of royalty as a role for performers. York's Herod and Skelton's Magnyfycence are compositions of characterization techniques which demonstrate that dramatic artists early in the Tudor period clearly conceived of the king as being, in a visual way, the player of a dramatic role. In the case of York's civic cycle, the ancient origins of the drama suggest that this notion may have been alive for perhaps a century or more before the Tudor dynasty began and the Sixteenth Century dramatists revised the drama into its final form. Marlowe's Tamburlaine shows that the idea of the Actor King had taken a profound turn by the late Sixteenth Century, although an awareness that the handling of language is instrumental in the success of royalty's performance is plain in The Wars of Cyrus, considered as a play of the 1570s, and suggestions of that idea occur in Skelton's royal drama and in particular details of the old Herodian vaunts. These circumstances invite the proposition that the Actor King is a conception of royalty of interest to dramatic artists of the whole Tudor period.

In Shakespeare's treatment of Queen Elizabeth as Titania in A Midsummer Night's Dream we have a clue to the reasons for the dramatists' interest in the Actor King and in motifs related to that theme which emerge from the characterization techniques they used to portray figures of royalty. The portrait of the Fairy Queen, depicted as the supernatural lover of an enchanted dolt, captures the essence of royalty's nature in performing before a subject audience, and directly connects that conception of a sovereign ruler with England's reigning prince. The stage portrait of the king figure as an actor reflects the dramatist's vision of the nature of royalty in real life. Shakespeare continued to develop the idea in a multitude of variations in his chronicle plays and royal dramas, as critics of Shakespearean drama have observed. And, as Mrs. Righter argues, the theme of actor-ruler in a more general sense continued to be important in Shakespeare's other political plays, those with "quasi-kings" as important personae.

In dramatising the similarities between royal personages and the professional "counterfeiters" who portrayed them on the stage and in the playing place, Tudor dramatists were conforming to the spirit of the Renaissance. Like other knowledgeable men of the Sixteenth Century, the English dramatic poets were conscious of the ideal of individual autonomy which made a personal art of anything men could do. That philosophy allowed them, with psychological accuracy, to identify with a stage character like the king, a figure touched with sublimity, confused with supernatural beings, and having the scope to perform at the pinnacles of power over other mortals. Yet in fact being commoners, the playmakers were acutely aware of the shortcomings of moral and social man in fulfilling the ideals expressive of a personal vision, however majestic.

In an age and culture which made the display of royal magnificence and the manipulation of verbal artifices the tools of an official propaganda to promote the supremacy of the English monarchy over papal princes and continental sovereigns, Tudor dramatists could appreciate the likeness of the royal figure to members of their own profession of "counterfeiting" artists. The English dramatic poets had a two-way relationship with the kings they portrayed on the stage, a relationship that was not without affection and sympathy, as well as skepticism and ironical humour. They, the players and dramatic poets, were in significant ways like royalty, and royalty was much like them. Kings and playmakers borrowed each other's devices. Erasmus recognized the similarity:

> If a necklace, a scepter, royal purple robes, a train of attendants are all that make a king, what is to prevent the actors who come on the stage decked with all the pomp of the state from being called a king? What is it that distinguishes a real king from the actor?[1]

The difference between the two kinds of professional artificers, king and player, Erasmus offered, "is the spirit befitting a prince." But even that spirit might be simulated, perhaps even truly felt by the dramatic artist and actor. As Erasmus remarked elsewhere, "It is divine to play the part of king. . . ."[2] Whether the king was an actor, or, reversing the notion, an actor might be king, the theme of the Actor King that informs so many Tudor royal stage portraits expresses the aspiration of men of all estates and conditions to an ideal human nature, one with godlike and majestic power over others, even though that power was contrived through artifices of speech and dramatic show.

# FOOTNOTES

## Introduction

1. Felix E. Schelling, The English Chronicle Play (New York: Macmillan, 1902), 2.

2. Before Prof. Schelling's survey, two inquiries into the antecedents of Shakespeare's history plays facilitated study of the portraits of royalty in them: W. G. Boswell-Stone, Shakespeare's Holinshed: The Chronicle and the Historical Plays Compared (London: Chatto, 1896); and George B. Churchill, Richard the Third up to Shakespeare, Palaestra X (Berlin: Mayer and Müller, 1900; repr. New York: Johnson Reprint, 1970).

   C. F. Tucker Brooke attempts to define and classify king plays in The Tudor Drama: A History of English National Drama to the Retirement of Shakespeare (Boston, 1911; repr. Hamden, Conn. : Archon Books, 1964). Robert Metcalf Smith's Froissart and the English Chronicle Play (New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1915; repr. New York: Benjamin Blom, 1965), demonstrates how Shakespeare's selection of historical sources could colour the "character" of royal personae.

   Among useful works on doctrines of kingship, attitudes toward the king, and theories of historiography from which Shakespeare's royal portraits are drawn are Lily B. Campbell, ed. The Mirror for Magistrates, from original texts (1938; New York: Barnes and Noble, 1968), and her Shakespeare's 'Histories', Mirrors of Elizabethan Policy (San Marino, Calif. : Huntington Library, 1947; repr. London: Methuen, 1964); E. M. W. Tillyard, The Elizabethan World Picture (London: Chatto and Windus, 1943), and his Shakespeare's History Plays (London: Chatto and Windus, 1944); Irving Ribner, The English History Play in the Age of Shakespeare (Princeton: Univ. Press, 1957). Scholars who have examined non-Shakespearean king plays for their political doctrine are Sarah Ruth Watson, "Gorboduc and the Theory of Tyrannicide," Modern Language Review, XXXIV (1939), 355-366; Gertrude C. Reese, "Political Import of The Misfortunes of Arthur," Review of English Studies, XXI (1945), 81-91.

   A branch of historical scholarship concerned with Shakespeare's characterization of royalty treats the history plays as epic: Effie MacKinnon, "Notes on the Dramatic Structure of the York Cycle," Studies in Philology, XXVIII (1931), 433-439; Catherine Dunn, "The Medieval 'Cycle' as History Play," Studies in the Renaissance, VII (1960), 76-89; Jan Kott, Shakespeare Our Contemporary, trans. by Boleslaw Taborski (London: Methuen, 1964). Others disagree with their position, seeing Shakespeare's English king figures only as portraits of individuals: Robert A. Law, "The Composition of Shakespeare's Lancastrian Trilogy," Texas Studies in Language and Literature, III (1961), 321-327; Madeleine Doran, Endeavors of Art: A Study of Form in Elizabethan Drama (Madison: Univ. of Wisconsin Press, 1954), 112-115, although she grants them epic "sweep;" and James Winny, The Player King: A Theme of Shakespeare's Histories (London: Chatto and Windus, 1968), 10.

Samuel Taylor Coleridge originated the romantic, or "psychological" school of "character" interpretation of Shakespearean royalty in his essays published in the early Nineteenth Century, The Shakespearean Criticism, ed. Thomas Middleton Raysor, in two volumes (London: Constable, 1930), a tradition which A. C. Bradley carried on in the Twentieth Century in Shakespearean Tragedy: Lectures on Hamlet, Othello, King Lear, Macbeth (2nd ed. London: Macmillan, 1905, 1966).

Rebels arguing that the "personality" of Shakespeare's royalty is an illusion derived from combinations of conventions are L. L. Schücking, Character Problems in Shakespeare's Plays (London: Harrap, 1922), and E. E. Stoll, Art and Artifice: A Study in Dramatic Contrast and Illusion (Cambridge: University Press, 1933; repr. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1962).

Studies of particular conventions employed in Elizabethan drama to characterize princely figures are Ruth L. Anderson, Elizabethan Psychology and Shakespeare's Plays (University of Iowa Humanistic Studies III, 4, Iowa City: Iowa Univ. Press, 1927); John W. Draper, The Humors & Shakespeare's Characters (Durham, N. C.: Duke Univ. Press, 1945); Lawrence Babb, The Elizabethan Malady: A Study of Melancholia in English Literature from 1580-1642 (East Lansing: Michigan State College Press, 1951); Bernard Spivack, Shakespeare and the Allegory of Evil: The History of a Metaphor in Relation to His Major Villains (New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1958); Honor Matthews, Character & Symbol in Shakespeare's Plays: A Study of Certain Christian and Pre-Christian Elements in Their Structure and Imagery (Cambridge: Univ. Press, 1962); and M. M. Reese, The Cease of Majesty: A Study of Shakespeare's History Plays (London: Edward Arnold, 1961), emphasizing the incongruous ideals of medieval and humanist thought.

Analyses of conventional elements contributing to Shakespeare's royal portraits are Erich Auerbach, "The Weary Prince," in Mimesis: The Representation of Reality in Western Literature (1946), trans. Willard R. Trask (Princeton: Univ. Press, 1953);

Ludwig Borinski, "'Soldat' und 'Politiker' Bei Shakespeare und Seinen Zeitgenossen" (The Soldier and the Politician in the Works of Shakespeare and His Contemporaries), in *Shakespeare Jahrbuch,* XCI (1955), 89-120); Ernest W. Talbert, *The Problem of Order: Elizabethan Political Commonplaces and an Example of Shakespeare's Art* (Chapel Hill: Univ. of North Carolina Press, 1962), 146-200).

The approach to Shakespeare's royal characterization through imagery, pioneered by Carolyn F. E. Spurgeon *Shakespeare's Imagery and What It Tells Us*, with charts and illustrations (Cambridge: Univ. Press, 1935), has contributions from Wolfgang Clemen, e. g. *A Commentary on Shakespeare's Richard III,* English version by Jean Bonheim of *Kommentatar zu Shakespeares Richard III: Intrepretation eines Dramas*, (Göttingen, 1957; London: Methuen, 1968), and James Winny. Along with Prof. Clemen, A. P. Rossiter observed the effect that formal patterns, including verbal and scenic arrangements, have on the "personalities" of Shakespeare king figures, in *Angel With Horns, and Other Shakespeare Lectures,* ed. Graham Storey (New York: Theatre Arts Books, 1961). Studies of the characterization of other Tudor king figures are W. E. Tomlinson, *Der Herodes-Charakter in Englischen Drama,* Palaestra 195 (Leipzig: Mayer & Müller, 1934); Roscoe E. Parker, "The Reputation of Herod in the Early English Literature," *Speculum* VIII (1933), October, 59-67); Maurice J. Valency, *The Tragedies of Herod & Mariamne* (New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1940; repr. New York: AMS Press, 1966).

The last word is for a Shakespeare critic whose work is of special value for this study: G. Wilson Knight, who has dealt comprehensively with the mystical symbolism of the crown in the poetic and spectacular imagery of Shakespeare's royal drama, and with its significance for the nature of royalty. *The Sovereign Flower: On Shakespeare as the Poet of Royalism* (London: Methuen, 1958), 20, 60, 88-96, 266-279. Prof. Knight has also made his specialty the coordination of the actor's gestures with the language of a princely character's poetic speech in Shakespearean drama. 1974 Pacific Northwest Renaissance Conference, Univ. Saskatchewan, Regina, Sask., March 17, 1974. Cf. *The Sovereign Flower,* 223.

3. James Winny, *The Player King*, 45.

4. Anne Righter, *Shakespeare and the Idea of the Play* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, Chatto and Windus, [1962] 1967), 54.

5. Ibid., 91.

6. Ibid., 121.

7. The archbishop's speech (*Henry V*, I, ii) may be intended as evidence of the *realpolitik* of Henry's shrewd ecclesiasts, according to Prof. Wilfred Watson, who kindly explained the passage to me.

## Chapter I

1. All quotations from the Coventry Shearmen and Taylors' pageant are from the text, re-edited from the edition of Thomas Sharp, 1825, in Two Coventry Corpus Christi Plays, ed. Hardin Craig, Early English Text Society, Extra Series 87 (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner, 1902), 1-32. The text is based on the manuscript of Robert Croo, 1534. Craig, ed., ibid., xxiv.

2. All quotations from King Darius are from the Tudor Facsimile Text, ed. John S. Farmer (London and Edinburgh: T. C. & E. C. Jack, 1907). This edition is dated 1577, but an earlier edition appeared about 1565.

   In quoting from King Darius I have regularized, where necessary, u/v and i/j for easier reading, a procedure followed in quoting other texts as well.

3. All quotations from George Peele's King Edward the First are from the text in the Malone Society Reprint, prepared by W. W. Greg. ([London]: Oxford Univ. Press, 1911). The play is dated 1593.

4. All citations from Thomas Norton's and Thomas Sackville's Gorboduc are from the text in Early English Classical Tragedies, ed. with intro. by John W. Cunliffe (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1912), 1-64. Norton wrote the first three acts, and Sackville, the last two, according to the title-page of the 1565 quarto.

5. All passages quoted from The Tragedy of Locrine are from the text in the Malone Society Reprint, prepared by Ronald B. McKerrow and W. W. Greg ([London]: Oxford Univ. Press, 1908). The play is dated 1595.

6. All quotations from Christopher Marlowe's Edward the Second are from the text in the Malone Society Reprint, prepared by W. W. Greg ([London]: Oxford Univ. Press, 1925). The play is dated 1594.

7. All passages cited from Thomas Preston's Cambyses King of Persia, c. 1570-1584, are from the Tudor Facsimile Text, ed. John S. Farmer (Edinburgh & London: privately printed, 1910).

8. All citations from Ludus Coventriae, c. 1590-1595, are from the text in Ludus Coventriae, or the Plaie Called Corpus Christi, ed. K. S. Block (London: H. Milford, Oxford Univ. Press, 1922). Dating of this play in its final form depends upon paper used in an interpolated section of the manuscript (Block, ed., ibid., xi), and the handwriting found on it (xvi).

9. Hardin Craig, ed. Two Coventry Corpus Christi Plays, 90.

10. All citations from Mary Magdalene are from the text in The Digby Plays with an Incomplete "Morality," ed. F. J. Furnivall, Early English Text Society, Extra Series 70 (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner, 1896), 53-136. The play was recopied about 1512. Furnivall, ed., ibid., xv.

11. All passages quoted from George Gascoigne's and Francis Kinwelmersh's Jocasta are from the text in Early English Classical Tragedies, ed. John W. Cunliffe, 65-159. The play was first printed in 1573. Jocasta is an adaptation of the Venetian Lodovico Dolce's Italian version of Euripides' drama. Dolce himself used a Latin translation of the Greek text published in 1541. Ibid., xxxvi-xxxvii; lxxxiii-lxxxv. A controversial discussion of the expression "going about the stage" is in Richard Southern, The Staging of Plays before Shakespeare (London: Faber & Faber, 1973), passim.

12. All references and quotations from The True Tragedy of Richard the Third are from the text in the Malone Society Reprint, prepared by W. W. Greg ([London]: Oxford Univ. Press, 1921). The play is dated 1594.

13. All quotations from Godly Queene Hester are from the text in A New Enterlude of Godly Queene Hester, ed., from a quarto of 1561, by W. W. Greg (Louvaine, Leipzig & London: Uystpruyst; Harrassowitz; David Nutt, 1904).

14. For the effect of Banquo's address to an empty throne in Shakespeare's Macbeth, III, i, J. L. Styan, Shakespeare's Stagecraft (Cambridge: Univ. Press, 1967), 73. On simultaneous staging which makes the throne part of a play or pageant, George R. Kernodle, From Art to Theatre: Form and Convention in the Renaissance (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1943), 132. On the winching up of a stage throne to the "heavens" to allow actors the centre stage, Glynne Wickham, Early English Stages, in two volumes (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1959), II (i), 315.

15. All quotations from Shakespeare's plays are from the text of The First Folio (1623), facsimile ed. by Charlton Hinman (New York: W. W. Norton, 1968).

16. Wickham, Early English Stages, II (i), 220.

17. James Paul Brawner, ed. The Wars of Cyrus: An Early Classical Narrative Drama of the Child Actors, critical edit. with notes (Urbana: Univ. of Ill. Press, 1942), 10 f.

18. All passages quoted from The Wars of Cyrus are from the text in Ibid.

19. All references to the play and passages quoted are from Mundus and Infans, Tudor Facsimile Text, ed. John Farmer, from Wynkyn de Worde's 1522 edition (London & Edinburgh: T. C. & E. C. Jack, 1909).

20. All references to *King Johan* and passages cited from it are from the text in John Bale, *King Johan*, Malone Society Reprint, prepared by John Henry Pyle Pafford ([London]: Oxford Univ. Press, 1931). The manuscript dates from c. 1538 to c. 1563, and is in two hands, marked here as A and B. Pafford, ed., ibid., xii-xvii.

21. Craig, *Two Coventry Corpus Christi Plays*, 82, 84, 86.

22. All quotations from the play are from the text in *The Scottish History of James the Fourth*, Malone Society Reprint, prepared by A. E. H. Swaen and W. W. Greg ([London]: Oxford Univ. Press, 1931). The play is dated 1598.

23. All passages quoted from the play are from the text in *Alphonsus King of Aragon* [attrib. Robert Greene], Malone Society Reprint prepared by W. W. Greg ([London]: Oxford Univ. Press, 1926).

24. Craig, *Two Coventry Corpus Christi Plays*, 82, 86.

25. All references to Thomas Hughes's *The Misfortunes of Arthur* (1587), and all passages quoted from it are from the text in *Early English Classical Tragedies*, ed. John W. Cunliffe, 215-296. The Gentlemen of Gray's Inn presented it at the royal court in Greenwich, Feb. 28, 1588.

26. All quotations from the play are from the text in Thomas Lodge and Robert Greene, *A Looking-Glass for London and England*, Malone Society Reprint, prepared by W. W. Greg ([London]: Oxford Univ. Press, 1932). The play is dated 1594.

27. All passages from *Herod's Killing of the Children* are quoted from the text, based on the manuscript of 1512, in *The Digby Plays*, ed. F. J. Furnivall, 1-23.

## Chapter II

1. Mark Eccles, ed. *The Macro Plays,* Early English Text Society (London: Oxford Univ. Press, 1969), xxxiii and 203. This play, among the Macro manuscripts, is dated in the late Fifteenth Century (1465-1470) by the handwriting (xxvii). A fragmentary manuscript of *Wisdom* among the Digby collection was copied at a later date, c. 1512. F. J. Furnivall, ed. *The Digby Plays,* xv-xvi. The Digby manuscript is substantially the same as the Macro. In quoting from *Wisdom,* I have used the Digby text, ibid., 137.

2. On the prosody of *The Play of the Weather,* J. E. Bernard Jr., *The Prosody of the Tudor Interlude,* Yale Studies in English (New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1939, repr. New York: Archon Books, 1969), 65-66. All references to Heywood's play here are from the text in *The Play of the Weather,* 1533 edition, Tudor Facsimile Text, ed. John S. Farmer (London & Edinburgh: T. C. & E. C. Jack, 1909). Another edition of the play was published in 1565.

3. See, for instance, the account of the Palm Sunday ceremony and Mass, celèbrating Christ's entry into Jerusalem as a victory of the *Rex Gloriae* over his adversaries, in O. B. Hardison, *Christian Rite and Christian Drama in the Middle Ages; Essays in the Origin and Early History of the Modern Drama* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1965), 111-114. The idea of Christ as king appears in the earliest complex Latin Resurrection play known, the Twelfth Century Ripoll text (239-244, 301-304). Allusions to divine kingship also occur in the O-Antiphons before Christmas, and the Octave of Christmas, all Medieval liturgical offices. S. J. P. Van Dijk and J. Hazelden Walker, *The Origins of the Modern Liturgy: Liturgy of the Papal Court and the Franciscan Order in the Thirteenth Century* (London: Darton, Longmann & Todd, 1960), 454-458. Prayers of the Middle Ages and of recent times regard Jesus as "reigning" with God the Father. Theodore Klauser, *A Short History of the Western Liturgy; An Account and Some Reflections,* trans. John Halliburton (London: Oxford Univ. Press, 1969), 30.

4. All passages quoted from *The Chester Plays* are from *The Chester* Plays, re-edited from the manuscripts by Hermann Deimling and F. J. Furnivall, Early English Text Society, Extra Series 62, 115. (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner, 1893), based on the manuscript of 1607, but including variants for 1592, 1600, and 1604. Another manuscript exists, dated 1591.

   The Chester cycle enjoyed an unexplained revival during the last decade of the Sixteenth Century, even though production of most dramas like it had ceased by the 1580s. Deimling, ed., ibid., Part I, vii. Revised though it may have been to accommodate the demands of the 1590s and early 1600s, the dramatic conventions which *The Chester Plays* has in common with similar drama of earlier date properly belong to the Tudor drama as a whole.

On the decline of cyclical drama in England, cf. Harold C. Gardiner, Mysteries End, An Investigation of the Last Days of the Medieval Religious Stage (New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1946), passim; Wickham, II (i), 3-149; E. K. Chambers, The Medieval Stage, in two volumes (London: Oxford Univ. Press, [1903] 1967), II, 111-112, 221 f., 271 f., 353, 373; Chambers, The Elizabethan Stage, in four volumes (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1923), I, 112-119, 237, 241, 279 f.; IV, 265-266; Virginia C. Gildersleeve, Government Regulations of the Elizabethan Drama (New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1908), passim; J. S. Purvis, From Minster to Market Place (York: St. Anthony's Press, 1969), 28-30; York Court of High Commission, 1575/6, HC AB 9, Folio 20.

5. Craig, Two Coventry Corpus Christi Plays, 93, 97, 107.

6. In the primitive Christian church the eucharistic meal was considered a joyful foretaste of the eschatological banquet in the Kingdom of Christ, a meaning Jesus seems to have given it himself, according to the Gospels of Mark (14: 25) and Luke (22: 6). Klauser, A Short History of Western Liturgy, 10.

Chapter III

1. In The Cease of Majesty, Professor Reese was especially interested in the morality play structure as John Bale employed it in King Johan, and as Thomas Norton and Thomas Sackville used it in Gorboduc.

2. David M. Bevington, From Mankind to Marlowe: Growth and Structure in the Popular Drama of Tudor England (Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press, 1962); Tudor Drama and Politics: A Critical Approach to Topical Meaning (Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press, 1968).

3. John Overton Orrell, The Repeated Scene: A Study of Formal Parallelism in Elizabethan Tragedy, Diss. Toronto, 1963 (Facs. publ., Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms, Xerox Company, 1972), 5-6.

4. Ibid., 49-50.

5. Ibid., 195.

6. Ibid., 4-5. In explaining repetition as a general characteristic of art, Professor Orrell illustrates his point with examples from poetry in which important features have common characteristics to make them moral counterparts of each other. Parallel structure of the Houses of Pride and Holiness, in Spenser's The Faerie Queene, and of the Parliaments of Heaven and Hell, in Milton's Paradise Lost, define the opposite moral nature of the groups of figures connected with each. A useful account of the literary history of the "psychomachia," or metaphorical holy war between the forces of good and evil is in Spivack, Allegory of Evil, 60-95.

7. Ludus Coventriae is compiled mainly from a mass of play scripts transcribed at least a generation before the drama's final revision which, because of the watermark on the paper, is thought to date sometime in the last decade of the Fifteenth Century. Block, ed. Ludus Coventriae, xi and xv.

8. Aristotle, The Politics, trans. with intro. T. A. Sinclair (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1962), Book III, Ch. 14, 135-138.

9. Desiderius Erasmus, The Education of a Christian Prince, trans. Lester K. Born ([1936], repr. New York: Octagon, 1965). The work was written in 1515, printed in 1516; Henry VIII received a copy as a gift in 1517. On the king as a copy of Christ, 157-159, 177; as a likeness of God, 168; on royal compassion and love for subjects, 149, 162, 205; on the king's Christian reverence, 148-153; on his peacefulness, 249 f.; on his courtesy, 145-146, 209; on royalty's need to shun vulgarity and base ideas, 145-146, 153.

Erasmus defines the tyrant as bestial (150), evil (157), and cruel (161, 163-164). For his comparison of king and tyrant, 161-169. Erasmus condemns royal banquets, and largess, including feasts for the masses (206).

10. Craig, ed. Two Coventry Corpus Christi Plays, 82, 86, 87.

11. On Herod's "fawchon," ibid., 82, 84, 86; on his sword, The Chester Plays, ed. Deimling, VIII, 189-196, etc.; on Herod's spear, Ludus Coventriae, ed. Block, 20: 12.

12. A stage direction in the Coventry Shearmen and Taylors' pageant reads: "Here Erode ragis in the pagond and in the strete also" (783-784). On Herod's masks, Craig, ed. Two Coventry Corpus Christi Plays, 86, and Valency, The Tragedies of Herod and Marianne, 29-30.

## Chapter IV

1. R. A. Foakes, "The Player's Passion: Some notes on Elizabethan Psychology and Acting," Essays and Studies, VII (1954), 65-66, 71; Lise-Lone Marker, "Nature and Decorum in the Theory of Elizabethan Acting," in The Elizabethan Theatre II, ed. David Galloway, Second International Conference on Elizabethan Theatre, University of Waterloo, Ontario, July 1969 (Toronto: Macmillan of Canada; Univ. of Waterloo, 1970), 91-92.

2. "There is not a more playne figure of idlenesse than playinge at dise." Sir Thomas Elyot, The Boke named The Governour, in two vols., ed. from first ed., 1531, by H. H. S. Croft (London: Kegan Paul, 1880), I, xxvi. Cf. "image of sloth and picture of a slave," in 2 Tamburlaine, IV, i, 91. Christopher Marlowe, Tamburlaine The Great in Two Parts, ed. U. M. Ellis-Fermor (London: Methuen, 1930; repr. New York: Gordian Press, 1966).

3. E. K. Chambers, Medieval Stage, I, passim, but especially 85-86, 185, 192 f., 207 f., 213 f.; II, 30, 33, 47. Allardyce Nicholl, Masks, Mimes and Miracles: Studies in the Popular Theatre (New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1931), 135-213; on the doctor, 26-27, 43, 114, 186-187, etc.; fool, 27-28; messenger, 45. On the function of the doctor in St. George plays and other ludi, Chambers, The English Folk-Play (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1933), passim. On the medieval functions of the fool, Enid Welsford, The Fool; His Social Literary History (London: Faber & Faber, 1935).

4. Alexander Barclay, The Ship of Fools, in two vols., trans. Alexander Barclay from Sebastian Brandt, ed. T. H. Jamieson (Edinburgh: W. Paterson, 1874; repr. New York: AMS Press, 1966). Among Barclay's types are the religious hypocrite, card players and dicers, vain boasters, geometers, astrologers and other overcurious clerks, froward women, negligent fathers, and beggars. On Barclay's influence on satirical characterization, Arthur Koelbing, "Barclay and Skelton, Early German Influences on English Literature," in Cambridge History of English Literature, ed. A. W. Ward and A. R. Waller (Cambridge: Univ. Press, 1909), III, 56-82.

5. Desiderius Erasmus, On Copia of Words and Ideas (De Utraque Verborem ac Rerum Copia), trans. with intro. by Donald B. King and H. David Rix, Medieval Philosophical Texts in Translation 12 (Milwaukee: Marquette Univ. Press, 1963), 2. See, for example, Erasmus' remarks on prosopopoeia (description of persons); prosopographia (personification); and notatio (character sketches), 50-54.

6. For example, Sir Thomas Elyot's definition and examples of Magnificence, as a mean with vicious extremes. The Governour, II, 111-119.

7. Grace Frank, *The Medieval French Drama* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1954), 245 f.; and Ian Maxwell, *French Farce and John Heywood* (Melbourne and London: Melbourne and Oxford Univ. Presses, 1946), *passim*.

8. Borinski, "'Soldat' und 'Politiker,'" 87-88. Cf. Talbert, *The Problem of Order*, and Auerbach, "The Weary Prince," 312-333.

9. This treatment of Herod seems to be a late addition to the cycle, distinguishable from the contents announced in the Proclamation. K. S. Block, ed., *Ludus Coventraie*, xxxi.

10. John H. P. Pafford, ed. *King Johan*, xxi.

11. For example, Grimald's "A true love," in Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey; Sir Thomas Wyatt the Elder, Nicholas Grimald and Uncertain Authors, *Tottel's Miscellany; Songes and Sonnettes*, First ed. of 5th June, collated with Second ed. of 31st July, 1557, ed. by Edward Arber (Westminster: A. Constable, 1903), 96. This piece couples the idea of Queen Mary with the beauty of the "happy land" which brought her forth. A similar feeling is in "The Lover to His dear, of exceding love," addressed to Carie, who "wert cause of all the smart" (96), a rehandling, like much of Grimald's verse, of poems from Theodore de Beza's first edition of poems, *Poemata Juvenilia* (1548). This piece, like many others in *Tottel's Miscellany*, expresses the lover's wish to die. Its model, also composed by Beza, is addressed to Publia. Nicholas Grimald, *The Life and Poems of Nicholas Grimald*, trans. by L. R. Merrill (New Haven and London: Humphrey Milford, Oxford Univ. Press, 1925), 417-418.

12. Cf. Borinski, "'Soldat' und 'Politiker,'" 92-93.

13. On the careless syllabification and rhyming, and on the distribution of rhyme royal in *King Johan*, Bernard, *The Prosody of the Tudor Interlude*, 90-92.

14. On the 'Apocalyptic' politics of Elizabeth's government, J. E. Neal, *Queen Elizabeth* I (London: Jonathan Cape, 1934; repr. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1960), 233. A medal of 1587, showing Queen Elizabeth enthroned, vanquishing the beast of the Apocalypse underfoot is in R. C. Strong and J. H. VanDorsten, *Leicester's Triumph*, pub. for Sir Thomas Browne Institute (Leiden: Univ. Press, 1964; London: Oxford Univ. Press, 1964), Plate 3. For John Bale's contributions to the Tudor version of English history, with its apocalyptic elements, Jesse Harris, *John Bale, A Study in the Minor Literature of the Reformation* (Urbana: Univ. of Illinois Press, 1940), 93-119; Thora B. Blatt, *The Plays of John Bale. A Study of Ideas, Technique and Style* (Copenhagen: G. E. C. Gad, 1968), 35-62.

15. *Lydgate's Fall of Princes* [G. Boccaccio], ed. Henry Bergen in four volumes (Washington: Carnegie Institution, 1923), IV, viii and 106 f. Pynson's 1494 and 1527 editions, and Tottel's 1554 edition have illustrations showing Fortune's Wheel, but Wayland's edition of c. 1554 did not. A Thirteenth Century illustration for the first folio of *Carmina Burana* shows Fortune in the centre of the wheel, a crownless man reaching for the top, another with crown and scepter enthroned on top, a falling figure losing his crown, and a recumbant figure crushed under the wheel. *Carmina Burana: Lateinische und Deutsche Leider und Gedichte Einer Handschrift Des XIII. Jahrhunderts aus Benedictbeurern,* auf Der K. Bibliothek Zu Mü~~u~~nchen (Stuttgart, 1847, repr. Amsterdam: Editions RODOPI, 1966), 1. Prof. Bergen reproduces a Wheel of Fortune from a German translation of Boccaccio's *De Casibus Virorum Illustrium,* published in 1545. *Lydgate's Fall of Princes,* i, frontispiece. The work of Hans Weiditz, the illustration depicts blindfolded Fortune turning a machine; the figures on her wheel are beast-men, the crowned figure on top having an ass's head.

16. All quotations from *The Mirror* are from the text in *The Mirror for Magistrates*, ed. Lily B. Campbell, for Huntington Library (Cambridge: Univ. Press, 1938). *The Mirror* is a continuation of Lydgate's *Fall of Princes.* It was first published in 1559, with more tragedies added to the editions of 1563, 1578, and 1587. Seven editions of it, as well as imitations, appeared during Elizabeth's reign. Campbell, *Tudor Conceptions of History and Tragedy in "A Mirror for Magistrates"* (Berkeley: Univ. California Press, 1936), 10.

17. Campbell, *Tudor Conceptions of History and Tragedy,* 4.

## Chapter V

1. On the tuning of the voice to the external gestures and to the sense of the tropes in the dialogue, Bertram L. Joseph, Elizabethan Acting (London: Oxford Univ. Press, 1964), 25 f. and 82 f. Lise-Lone Marker quotes Abraham Fraunce's The Arcadian Rhetorike on the specific modes of speech directly associated with the proper expression of particular passions and reactions in a role, and on managing the voice, in "Nature and Decorum" 87-107.

2. Wickham, Early English Stages, II (i), 153-323).

3. Spurgeon, Shakespeare's Imagery. Professor Spurgeon uses "image" to refer to every kind of simile, as well as to all metaphor, which she considers "compressed simile" (5). To her, also imagery is not only visual, but includes every imaginative picture or experience which comes through the senses, the mind, and the emotions. But it must be used for the purposes of analogy.

4. Wickham, Early English Stages, II (i), 206-244, and relevant illustrations.

5. Richard Southern, The Medieval Theatre in the Round (London: Faber & Faber, 1957), passim.

6. Erasmus, Education of a Christian Prince, 176.

7. Ibid., 167.

8. The conventions of Tudor pageantry are thoroughly treated in Sydney Anglo, Spectacle, Pageantry and Early Tudor Policy (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969). For royal pageantry in medieval England, Wickham, Early English Stages, I, 51-111.

9. Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, of the Reign of Henry VIII, ed. J. S. Brewer, J. Gairdner, R. H. Brodie (London: H. M. Stationery Office, 1862-1932), VIII, 949: June 30, 1935, Chapuys to [Granvelle].

10. A ship on a globe, with the motto Auxilio divino, an emblem for Sir Francis Drake, inverts the scenic image of the gift to King Rasni in Lodge's and Greene's A Looking-Glass for London and England, mentioned earlier. Geffrey Whitney, A Choice of Emblemes, and Other Devises (1586), ed. Henry Green (London: 1866, facs. repr. Heldesheim and New York: George Olms, 1971), 203. Whitney's woodcuts contain other devices similar to those found in plays under scrutiny here, e. g. the "car" of the neglectful charioteer, drawn by headstrong horses (6); an emblem and motto devoted to false report (20); slothful men sleeping in beds of down (42); a "neighbor's" burning house (31); the lion device associated with a king as "bewraying" his inward bloody thoughts (45); and the idea that the blackamore

may change his colour ("Aethiopem lavare") (57). The work contains several pictures of chariots, bows and arrows, serpents, cups, and Fortune on a wheel (181). Elizabethan portraiture and medals are saturated with emblems. Roy C. Strong, The Elizabethan Image: Painting in England 1540-1620, catalogue, Tate Gallery Exhibition, 28 Nov. 1969-8 Feb. 1970 (London: Tate Gallery, 1969), 51.

11. Ben Jonson reported that playwright John Heywood's "Impressa" or badge during Queen Mary's reign was "a compass with one foot in the center, the other broken, the word, Deest quod duceret orbem." Quoted in Robert W. Bolwell, The Life and Works of John Heywood (1921; repr. New York: AMS Press, 1966), 59. Robert Greene varied his mottos which sometimes appeared on printed editions of his works: "Sero, sed serio" and "By peace Plenty, by Wisdome Peace" are on the title page of Francesco's Fortunes, Or The Second part of Greenes Never too late (1590), in Life and Complete Works in Prose of Robert Greene, M. A., ed. Alexander B. Grosart, in fifteen volumes (New York: Russell & Russell, 1964), VIII, 113; "Temporis filia veritas" and "Omne tulit qui miscuit utile dulci" are his mottos on the title-page of Pandosto, The Triumph of Time, in ibid., IV, 227. Shakespeare designed an "impreso," an emblem with a motto, for the Earl of Rutland, contender in a tourney at court, for which he was paid forty-four shillings in gold. Gerald Eades Bentley, Shakespeare, A Biographical Handbook (New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1961), 62.

12. Rossiter, Angel with Horns, 1-22.

13. On the arrangements for the throne and estate of Tudor monarchs attending play performances, Wickham, Early English Stages, I, 244 f. and 355 f. He has floor plans for stage and throne in 1527 (Fig. 16); in Kings College Chapel, Cambridge, 1564 (Fig. 17); and at Oxford in 1566 (Fig. 19b).

14. Queen Elizabeth and the three goddesses associated with the Judgment of Paris appear in the Hans Eworth painting at Hampton Court. Michael Levey, Painting at Court (London: Weidenfeld & Nicholson, 1971), 95-96, and Fig. 79. Instead of an apple or a golden ball, the queen holds the royal orb. Roy Strong dates the painting 1569 in Portraits of Queen Elizabeth I (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1963), 79. The flattering comparison of the prince to Paris, who made a foolish judgment, is a formula of Renaissance compliments to royalty. Edgar Wind, Pagan Mysteries of the Renaissance (Harmondsworth: Penguin; Faber & Faber, [1958] 1967, 82-83. On the Renaissance fascination with triads and with triplicities resolvable in the One, 36-44, 192; on its relation to the Paris myth, 196-197.

## Chapter VI

1. Rene Wellek and Austin Warren, Theory of Literature (New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1956), 175 f. Among those adhering to this theory are G. Wilson Knight, and Wolfgang Clemen.

2. Samuel Taylor Coleridge, Coleridge's Shakespearean Criticism, ed. Thomas Middleton Raysor, in two volumes (London: Constable, 1930), II, 138.

3. A. P. Rossiter, Angel with Horns, 3.

4. On the significance of sun imagery in symbolism surrounding royalty of ancient oriental empires, which made the king, his vassals and satraps a reflection of the heavenly hierarchy of stars and planets, Hans P. L'Orange, Studies on the Iconography of Cosmic Kingship in the Ancient World, Instituttet for Sammenlignende Kulturforskning (Oslo and London: H. Aschelhoug; Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner, 1953), 9-138; on the transmission of these ideas to Europe as a result of the Crusades, and their subsequent circulation in Renaissance encyclopedias, 18-20.

   On the significance of light in Christian Neo-Platonism, as it appeared in the poetry and early gothic architecture of Abbot Suger of St-Denis in the Twelfth Century, Erwin Panofsky, Meaning in the Visual Arts: Papers in and on Art History. (Garden City, New York: Doubleday Anchor, 1955), 108-145.

5. I have borrowed this useful term from Sidney Anglo, Spectacle, Pageantry and Early Tudor Policy, 81, who recognizes the value of the many meanings concentrated in a single image as employed by artists and poets who designed the scenic and verbal imagery of Tudor pageantry.

6. Spurgeon, Shakespeare's Imagery, end charts.

7. There are numerous aids to understanding the symbolism relevant to the king figure in English drama, but three indispensable sources are the books of Moses and the Revelations of St. John the Divine in the Bible: Oxford Annotated Bible with the Apocrypha, ed. Herbert G. May and Bruce M. Metzger (New York: Oxford University Press, 1965); Jasper Heywood and His Translations of Seneca's "Troas," "Thyestes," and "Hercules Furens," ed. from octavos of 1559, 1560, and 1561 by H. deVocht (Louvain: A. Uyspryst, 1913); and Erasmus, Education of a Christian Prince.

8. For John Colet's philosophy and imagery, Ernst Cassirer, The Platonic Renaissance in England, trans. James P. Pettegrove (Austin: Univ. of Texas Press, 1953), 12-24; Erasmus, Erasmus and Cambridge: The Cambridge Letters of Erasmus, trans. D. F. S.

Thomson (Toronto: Univ. of Toronto Press, 1963), 17 f; T. M. Lindsay, "Englishmen and the Classical Renaissance," *Cambridge History of English Literature* (CHEL), III, 1-24.

9. For Sixteenth Century Englishmen, Hecuba at the scene of burning Troy is a standard picture of grief, gathering together related images of motherhood and civic disaster, in *Troas*, 13-86, and *passim*, in *Jasper Heywood and His Translations.* For light and darkness imagery of heavy weather, *Hercules Furens*, 1845-1854; for "internal" light and darkness imagery expressing the mental or emotional state of a character, *Thyestes*, 1664-1667; for garden imagery and its opposite, the wasteland, *Hercules Furens*, 603-606, 1421-1434, 1836-1839, and *Thyestes*, 1000-1003, all in ibid. The editor's comparison of Heywood's treatment of several contemporary editions of Senecan drama indicates that, while the Englishman made changes in meaning, he did not substantially alter the imagery, except perhaps to heighten it (xxiv-xxix).

10. Stephen Hawes, *The Pastime of Pleasure*, ed. William Edward Mead, Early English Text Society (London: Humphrey Milford, Oxford Univ. Press, 1928), 5-6; William Murison, "Stephen Hawes and John Skelton," in *Cambridge History of English Literature*, III, 223-238.

11. Coleridge, *Biographia Literaria*, ed. J. Shawcross (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1907), II, 15.

12. Marker, "Nature and Decorum in the Theory of Elizabethan Acting," 97-98.

13. Erasmus, *On Copia*, 47.

14. Ibid., 48.

15. George Puttenham, *The Arte of English Poesie*, ed. Gladys Doidge Willcock, Alice Walker (Cambridge: Univ. Press [1936] 1970), 238. On the dates of *The Arte's* composition, xliv-liii.

16. Erasmus, *Education of a Christian Prince*, 210.

## Chapter VII

1. Marker, "Nature and Decorum," and Foakes, "The Player's Passion." The following discussion of acting draws upon these two articles.

2. G. Wilson Knight so described and demonstrated the unified imagery of acting and poetry in Shakespearean royal drama at the 1974 Pacific Northwest Renaissance Conference in Regina, Sask. Cf. The Sovereign Flower, 223.

3. On staging arrangements, Brawner, ed. The Wars of Cyrus, 34-38. The play may have been staged at Court where the scenic devices, possibly including horses, would have been exceedingly elaborate. The Wars of Cyrus was almost certainly intended for production at Blackfriars.

4. Translated into English by Peter Whitehorne, The Art of War appeared in London in 1560, and was reprinted in 1573 and 1588. Niccolò Machiavelli, The Art of War (1521), rev. ed. of trans. Ellis Farnsworth, with intro. by Neal Wood (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, Library of Liberal Arts, 1965), xxx. Whitehorne's dedication to Queen Elizabeth in the 1560 edition is reprinted, 233-237. On Cyrus of Persia as a man of virtù, 77 and 207.

5. On the general as an actor, ibid., 128, 170, 165.

6. For Machiavelli's analogy of the princely general to the artist, ibid., 24-25, 209-210.

7. The sinews of war, according to Machiavelli, are men, arms, money, provisions, but the first two are most necessary. Ibid. 204. On the cavalry, its advantages and limitations, 43, 52-55, 81, 203, 205.

## Chapter VIII

1. Rossiter, Angel with Horns, 16 n.

2. John Middleton Murry, Shakespeare, (London: Jonathan Cape, 1936), 125.

3. Rossiter, Angel with Horns, 20-21. Wolfgang Clemen is also interested in Shakespeare's handling of the formal elements of Richard III, and the effect it had on the characterization of royalty. In his A Commentary on Shakespeare's Richard III, he noted particularly the conflict of realistic and unrealistic elements (202-230), and the symmetry of simultaneous staging of the enemy camps (204-205), which contribute to the parallelism of the portraits of Richard and Richmond. The result is that Richmond emerges as a significantly vaguer figure than Richard (211).

4. Rossiter, Angel with Horns, 16.

5. York Plays survives in the unique Asburnham manuscript copied in the early Fourteenth Century, but frequently amended thereafter, and, until the 1570s, still in use as part of the York Municipal Corporation's traditional religious festivals involving the craft guilds. L. T. Smith, ed. York Plays (New York: Russell and Russell, [1885] 1963), xi-xvii, xlv.

6. All passages quoted here from the York cycle are from York Plays, ed. L. T. Smith.

7. Erasmus, Education of a Christian Prince, 184. Homer is his authority.

8. Alexander Dyce, ed. Poetical Works of John Skelton, in two volumes (London: Thomas Rodd, 1863), I, xlii-xlv. The extant copy of the play has no date or publisher, but John Rastell is its probable printer. Skelton summarizes Magnyfycence in his Garlande of Laurell, published in 1523 (xciii). The relevant passages are in ibid., I, 409, lines 1192-1197.

9. Terms used by Magnyfycence and other characters to refer to him or to his qualities are "noble porte and fame" (165), "noblenesse" (190, 227, 267), "my magnyfycence" (229), "worshyp" (269), "noble fame" (273), "lordshyp" (289), "noble estate" (311), "state ryall" (388), "noble man" (404), "dygnyte" (2524), and so forth. Some of these expressions occur more than once. These citations from Magnyfycence, and all other passages of the play quoted here, are from the text in Poetical Works of John Skelton, ed. Dyce, I, 225-310.

Sir Thomas Elyot made the connection between princely magnificence and the Aristotelian ethics of citizenship in his The Boke of The Governour, ed. cit., II, 111. He explains Beneficence and Liberality as the private person's version of royal magnificence. As a virtue, magnificence is the product of a mean, requiring the bridle of reason, lest it be turned to vice. "And he is only liberall whiche distributeth accordyng to his substance, and where it is expedient" (113). Elyot commends liberality, especially in noblemen, although "it somwhat do exceede the termes of measure." If well employed, liberality brings honour to the giver, and "moche frute and singular commoditie thereby encreaseth" (118).

Erasmus' treats the idea of magnificence differently when he writes on the "Order of the City or Kingdom" as a "most Magnificent Object:"

> A chorus dance is a delightful spectacle if it is developed in rhythm and harmony. On the other hand, it is a farce when the gestures and voices are a confused jumble. So a city (civitas) or kingdom is a wonderful thing if each citizen has his own place, if each one performs his own peculiar duties, that is, if the prince conducts himself as he should, if the magistrates are faithful to their parts, and if the common folk yield to obedience to good laws and honorable magistrates. But when the prince looks out for his own business and the magistrates do nothing but fleece the people, when the common people do not obey fair laws, but only flatter the prince and officials, whatever the matter may be, then there is sure to be a disgraceful lack of order in everything. (Education of a Christian Prince, 235-236.

Skelton seems to be drawing on the traditions voiced by both Elyot and Erasmus.

10. U. M. Ellis-Fermor, ed. Tamburlaine the Great, in two parts (London: Methuen, 1930; repr. New York: Gordian Press, 1966), 6-10. Copies exist of four editions of the play, dated 1590, 1593, 1597, and 1605-06 (1-6). For evidence of Marlowe's authorship, 11-17. On the tradition that Marlowe acted the role of Tamburlaine, 13. For the play's stage history, 61-62.

11. All quotations from Tamburlaine are from the text in Tamburlaine The Great, ed. U. M. Ellis-Fermor, based on the 1590 octavo edition.

12. On the close relation of speech and speaker for the portrait of Tamburlaine, Wolfgang Clemen, English Tragedy before the Shakespeare: The Development of Dramatic Speech, trans. T. S. Dorsch (London: Methuen, 1961). "For Tamburlaine the set speech is a

necessary and constant condition of his existence; it is the very stuff and substance of his role in the play" (114).

13. A scholarly consensus dates the play in 1594-1595. Francis Meres mentions it in his Palladis Tamia, 1598, and it was published under Shakespeare's authorship, in a quarto edition of 1600, "as it hath beene sundry times publickely acted, by the Right honourable, the Lord Chamberlaine his servants." Hardin Craig, ed., The Complete Works of Shakespeare (Chicago: Scott, Foresman, 1951), 182.

14. Strong, The Elizabethan Image, 34.

15. Ian C. Sowton, ed. Edmund Spenser, A Selection of His Works (Toronto: Macmillan, 1968), lxxxii-lxxxiv.

16. Strong, The Elizabethan Image, 34 and 45. In 1591, a Fairy Queen and her maids saluted the Queen at her rising during her stay at Elvetham as guest of the Earl of Hertford. Neale, Queen Elizabeth I, 213-215.

17. Strong, The Elizabethan Image, frontispiece.

18. Crispin van de Passe the Elder, after a drawing by Isaac Oliver, Queen Elizabeth I (London: Victoria and Albert Museum, Dept. of Prints and Drawings E 3288, 1960).

19. Strong, The Elizabethan Image, 45 and Fig. 80. The Digby painting is attributed to Robert Peake.

20. Neale, Queen Elizabeth I, 259.

21. Quoted in Strong, The Elizabethan Image, 41. For the romantic tone at court, and the intimacy of its expression, Neale, Queen Elizabeth I, 217 f. On the queen's suitors, 208-209, 223-259, and passim. On beauty as a divine cult related to civil discipline, and the ethical effects of it on the people of the nation-state, Strong, Portraits of Queen Elizabeth I, 36 f.

22. On the imagery of Elizabeth's pageantry, Anglo, Spectacle, Pageantry, 344-359; on pompous ceremonies as the secret of her government, Neale, Queen Elizabeth I, 62-67; on the "scenic apparatus" of religious worship which Elizabeth had to compromise in the religious settlement, J. B. Black, The Reign of Elizabeth 1558-1603 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1936, 2nd ed., 1959, repr. 1965), 17; on her progresses, John Nichols, Progresses and Public Processions of Queen Elizabeth, in three volumes (London: privately printed, 1788-1823); on the artists who painted Queen Elizabeth, and the problems of her portraiture -- the presentation of the reality of an aging queen while preserving her myth, Strong, Portraits of Queen Elizabeth I, and Elizabethan Image, passim.

23. Strong, Elizabethan Image, 81.

24. Neale, Queen Elizabeth I, 208-209. On her romance with Englishmen in general, 215-221, and passim.

25. Black, The Reign of Elizabeth, 19, and Neale, Queen Elizabeth I, 396.

26. From the mid-Fifteenth Century to the Restoration, the English wool-textile industry was the economic foundation of the kingdom. Peter J. Bowden, The Wool Trade in Tudor and Stuart England, with a foreword by M. W. Beresford (London: Frank Cass [1962] 1971), xv-xvi. The making of cloth was the greatest occupation of the poor commons of England who wove woollens by the piece, sometimes one per week, in a cottage (family) industry scattered over about twenty English counties, according to Prof. Beresford (vii), where he quotes Eileen E. Power, The Wool Trade in English Medieval History (London: Oxford Univ. Press, 1941).

## Chapter IX

1. Erasmus, Education of a Christian Prince, 152.
2. Ibid., 174.

# CLASSIFIED BIBLIOGRAPHY

This Bibliography includes books and articles used in the preparation of the thesis, whether or not direct references to them are made in the text or footnotes.

## Primary Sources

### 1. Play Texts

*Alphonsus King of Aragon*, 1599. Attributed to Robert Greene. Edited with introduction and notes by W. W. Greg. Malone Society facsimile reprint. London: Oxford University Press, 1926.

*The Ancient Cornish Drama*. Translated, and with the Cornish text and diagrams, by Edwin Norris. 2 vols. [1859] Reprint, New York: Benjamin Blom, 1968.

Bale, John. *A comedy concernynge. . . Thre lawes of nature, Moses & Christ.* . . . Edited from the play compiled in 1538 and reprinted in 1562, by John S. Farmer. Tudor Facsimile Text. London and Edinburgh: T. C. and E. C. Jack, 1908. .

--------. *King Johan*. Edited from the manuscript of c. 1538 to c. 1563, with introduction and notes, by John Henry Pyle Pafford. Malone Society Facsimile Reprint. London: Oxford University Press, 1931.

*The Chester Plays.* Re-edited from the manuscripts, with introduction and notes, by Hermann Deimling and F. J. Furnivall. 2 vols. Early English Text Society, Extra Series 62 and 115. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner, 1893-1916.

*The Cornish Ordinalia: A Medieval Dramatic Trilogy.* Translated with introduction and notes by Markham Harris. Washington: Catholic University of America, 1969.

The Digby Plays with an Incomplete "Morality." Edited from the manuscripts, with introduction and notes, by F. J. Furnivall, and reissued from the plates prepared for the New Shakspere Society in 1882. Early English Text Society, Extra Series 70. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner, 1896.

Dramatic Documents from the Elizabethan Playhouses: Stage Plots; Actors' Parts; Prompt Books. Edited with introduction and notes by W. W. Greg. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1931.

Early English Classical Tragedies. Edited with introduction and notes by John W. Cunliffe. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1912.

The First Part of the Reign of King Richard the Second, or Thomas of Woodstock. Edited with introduction by Wilhelmina P. Frijlinck. Malone Society facsimile reprint. London: Oxford University Press, 1929.

Gascoigne, George. The Complete Works of George Gascoigne. Edited by J. W. Cunliffe. 2 vols. Cambridge English Classics. Cambridge: University Press, 1907.

Greene, Robert. Life and Complete Works in Prose and Verse of Robert Greene, M. A. Edited by Alexander B. Grosart. 15 vols. New York: Russell and Russell, 1964.

Grimald, Nicholas. The Life and Poems of Nicholas Grimald. Translated from the Latin, with parallel texts, introduction, biography, and notes by L. R. Merrill. Yale Studies in English. New Haven and London: Yale University Press; Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press, 1925.

Heywood, Jasper. Jasper Heywood and His Translations of Seneca's Troas, Thyestes, and Hercules Furens. Edited from the octavos of 1559, 1560, and 1561, with introduction and notes by H. de Vocht. Louvaine: A. Uyspryst, 1913; reprint, Vaduz: Kraus Reprint, 1963.

Heywood, John. The Dramatic Writings of John Heywood. Edited with introduction and notes by John S. Farmer. London: Early English Drama Society, 1905; reprint, Guildford: Charles W. Traylen, 1966.

--------. The Play of the Weather. The edition of 1533 of W. Rastell, edited and supervised by John S. Farmer. Tudor Facsimile Text. London and Edinburgh: T. C. and E. C. Jack, 1909.

King Darius. The 1577 edition, edited and supervised by John S. Farmer. Tudor Facsimile Text. London and Edinburgh: T. C. and E. C. Jack, 1907.

Kyd, Thomas. *The Works of Thomas Kyd.* Edited from the original texts with introduction, notes and facsimile pages by Frederick S. Boas. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1901.

Lodge, Thomas and Robert Greene. *A Looking-Glass for London and England*, 1594. Edited with introduction by W. W. Greg. Malone Society facsimile reprint. London: Oxford University Press, 1932.

*Lost Tudor Plays with Some Others; Recently Recovered English Dramatists*. Edited with notes by John S. Farmer. London: Early English Drama Society, 1907; reprint, Guildford: Charles W. Traylen, 1966.

*Ludus Coventriae, or the Plaie Called Corpus Christi.* Edited from the Cotton manuscript, Vespasian Dviii, with introduction, notes and facsimile pages, by K. S. Block. London: H. Milford, Oxford University Press, 1922.

Lyly, John. *The Complete Works of John Lyly.* Edited from the earliest quartos with life, bibliography, essays, notes and index by R. Warwick Bond. 3 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1902.

*The Macro Plays: The Castle of Perseverance, Wisdom, Mankind.* Edited from the manuscripts with introduction, notes and facsimile pages by Mark Eccles. Early English Text Society, [Original Series] 262. London: Oxford University Press, 1969.

Marlowe, Christopher. *Edward the Second.* The edition of 1594 edited with introduction by W. W. Greg. Malone Society facsimile reprint. London: Oxford University Press, 1925.

--------. *Tamburlaine the Great, in Two Parts.* Edited from the 1590 octavo edition, with introduction, notes, and illustrations by U. M. Ellis-Fermor. London: Methuen; reprint, New York: Gordian Press, 1966.

*Mundus and Infans, . . . a propre newe Interlude of the Worlde and the Chylde*. The Wynkyn de Worde edition, London, 1522, edited and supervised by John S. Farmer. Tudor Facsimile Text. London and Edinburgh: T. C. and E. C. Jack, 1909.

*The Nature of the Four Elements.* Attributed to John Rastell. The fragmentary edition of c. 1510-1520, edited and supervised by John S. Farmer. Tudor Facsimile Text. London and Edinburgh: T. C. and E. C. Jack, 1908.

*A New Enterlude of Godly Queene Hester.* Edited from the quarto of 1561, with introduction, by W. W. Greg. Louvaine, Leipzig and London: Uystpryst; Harrassowitz; David Nutt, 1904.

Peele, George. *The Arraignment of Paris.* Edited from the edition of 1584 with introduction and facsimile pages by Harold H. Child and W. W. Greg. Malone Society facsimile reprint. London: Oxford University Press, 1910.

--------. *King Edward the First.* The 1593 edition, edited with introduction by W. W. Greg. Malone Society facsimile reprint. London: Oxford University Press, 1911.

--------. *The Life and Works of George Peele.* Edited, with introduction and notes by Charles Tyler Prouty, general editor, and others. 3 vols., to date. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1952-.

Pikering, John. *The History of Horestes (A Newe Enterlude of Vice Conteyninge the Historye of Horestes).* The 1567 edition, edited and supervised by John S. Farmer. London and Edinburgh: privately published, 1910.

Preston, Thomas. *Cambyses King of Persia.* The edition of c. 1584, edited and supervised by John S. Farmer. Tudor Facsimile Text. Edinburgh and London: privately printed, 1910.

*Respublica: An Interlude for Christmas 1553.* Attributed to Nicholas Udall. Re-edited with introduction and notes by W. W. Greg. Early English Text Society, Original Series 226. London 1952 (for 1946); reprint, London: Oxford University Press, 1969.

*The Scottish History of James the Fourth.* Attributed to Robert Greene. The 1598 edition, edited with introduction and notes by A. E. H. Swaen and W. W. Greg. Malone Society facsimile reprint. London: Oxford University Press, 1921.

Shakespeare, William. *The Complete Works of Shakespeare.* Annotated texts of the plays, edited with an historical and critical background by Hardin Craig. Chicago: Scott, Foresman, 1951.

--------. *The First Folio of Shakespeare.* Facsimile reprint prepared with introduction and appendices by Charlton Hinman. New York: W. W. Norton, 1968.

Skelton, John. *Magnyfycence, A Moral Play by John Skelton.* Edited with introduction by Robert Lee Ramsey. 2 vols. Early English Text Society, Extra Series 91, 98. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner, 1906 (1908).

--------. *The Poetical Works of John Skelton.* Edited with introduction and notes by Rev. Alexander Dyce. 2 vols. London: Thomas Rodd, 1843.

Three Centuries of Drama: English 1500-1641. Microfilm copies of published editions, edited by Henry W. Wells. 4 vols. New York: Readex Microprint, 1955.

The Towneley Plays. Re-edited from the unique manuscript by George England, with introduction and notes by Alfred W. Pollard. Early English Text Society, Extra Series 71. Oxford: 1897; reprint, London: Oxford University press, 1966.

The Tragedy of Locrine. The edition of 1595 edited with introduction by Ronald B. McKerrow and W. W. Greg. Malone Society facsimile reprint. London: Oxford University Press, 1908.

The True Tragedy of Richard the Third. The edition of 1594 edited with introduction by W. W. Greg. Malone Society facsimile reprint. London: Oxford University Press, 1929.

Two Coventry Corpus Christi Plays. The Shearmen and Taylors' Pageant, re-edited from the edition of Thomas Sharp, 1825; and The Weavers' Pageant, re-edited from the manuscript of Robert Croo, 1534, with a plan of Coventry, notes, and appendices containing the chief records of the Coventry Plays, by Hardin Craig. Early English Text Society, Extra Series 87. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner, 1902.

The Wars of Cyrus: An Early Classical Narrative Drama of the Child Actors. Critical edition from the 1594 quarto, with introduction and notes by James Paul Brawner. University of Illinois Studies in Language and Literature, XXVIII. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1942.

York Plays, The Plays Performed by the Crafts or Mysteries of York on the Day of Corpus Christi in the 14th, 15th, and 16th Century. Edited from the unique Ashburnham manuscript with introduction, notes and glossary by Lucy Toulmin Smith, [1885]. Reissued, New York: Russell and Russell, 1963.

## 2. Other Works

Ascham, Roger. English Works: Toxophilus, Report of the Affaires and State of Germany, The Scholemaster. Edited by William Aldes Wright. Cambridge: University Press, [1904] 1970.

Bacon, Francis. Bacon's History of the Reign of King Henry VII. Edited with introduction by I. Rawson Rumby. Cambridge: University Press, 1902.

Barclay, Alexander. *The Ship of Fools, by Sebastian Brant*. Translated by Alexander Barclay. Edited by T. H. Jameson. 2 vols. Edinburgh: W. Paterson, 1874; reprint, New York: AMS Press, 1966.

Bruno, Giordano. *The Expulsion of the Triumphant Beast*. Bruno's *Spacchio de la bestia trionfonte* translated and edited with introduction and notes by Arthur D. Imerti. New Brunswick, N. J.: Rutgers University Press, 1964.

*Carmina Burana: Lateinische und Deutsche Leider und Gedichte Einer Handschrift Des XIII. Jahrhunderts aus Benedictbeurern auf Der K. Bibliothek Zu München.* Stuttgart: 1847. Reprint Amsterdam: Editions RODOPI, 1966.

Castiglione, Baldassar, *The Book of the Courtier.* Translated by Sir Thomas Hoby (1561), with an introduction by W. H. D. Rouse. London and New York: Dent, Dutton, 1966.

Cavendish, George. *The Life of Cardinal Wolsey*. Introduction by Henry Morley. London: George Routledge and Sons, 1890.

Caxton, William. *The dictes or sayengis of the philosophhores*. . . . (1477, 1480, 1489) *English Books, 1475-1640*, Microfilm Reel I-4.

Chaucer, Geoffrey. *Complete Works.* Edited with an introduction and notes by Walter W. Skeat. London: Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press, [1912] 1946.

Cellini, Benvenuto. *Autobiography.* Translated with introduction by George Bull. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1966.

Cox, Leonard. *The Arte or Crafte of Rhetoryke.* Edited with introduction by Frederick Ives Alexander. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1899.

*Cursor Mundi.* Edited from manuscripts in parallel texts by Rev. Richard Morris. 7 vols. Early English Text Society, Original Series 57, 59, 62, 66, 68, 99, 101. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner, 1874-1893.

*The Dance of Death.* Collated and edited from the original manuscripts by Florence Warren. Introduction and notes by Beatrice White. Early English Text Society, Original Series 181. London: Humphrey Milford; Oxford University Press, 1931.

Dee, Dr. John. *The Private Diary. . . and Catalogue of His Library of* Manuscripts. Edited from manuscripts at Ashmolean Museum, Oxford and Trinity College Library, Cambridge, by James Orchard Halliwell. Camden Society Vol. 19. London: John Bowyer Nichols and Son, 1842.

Elyot, Sir Thomas. *The Boke named The Governour, devised by Sir Thomas Elyot, Knight.* Edited from the first edition of 1531, with introduction and notes, by H. H. S. Croft. 2 vols. London: Kegan Paul, 1880.

*English Books, 1475-1640.* Microfilm copy of books in *Short-Title Catalogue,* edited by A. W. Pollard and G. R. Redgrave. Reels 1-1337.

Erasmus, Desiderius. *The Education of a Christian Prince.* Translated from the 1516 edition with introduction by Lester K. Born. New York: Columbia University Press, 1936. Reprint, New York: Octagon, 1965.

--------. *The Enchiridion* (*Enchiridion Militis Christiani,* Basel, 1519). Translated and edited with introduction by Raymond Himelick. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1963.

--------. *Erasmus and Cambridge: The Cambridge Letters of Erasmus.* Translated by D. F. S. Thomson, with introduction, commentary and notes by H. C. Porter. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1963.

--------. *The Praise of Folie.* Translation of Sir Thomas Chaloner, 1549, edited by Clarence H. Miller. Early English Text Society, Original Series 257. London: Oxford University Press, 1965.

--------. *On Copia of Words and Ideas* (*De Utraque Verborem ac Rerum Copia).* Translated from the Latin with introduction by Donald B. King and H. David Rix. Medieval Philosophical Texts in Translation 12. Milwaukee: Marquette University Press, 1963.

Geoffrey of Monmouth. *The History of the Kings of Britain.* Translated with introduction and appendices by Lewis Thorpe. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1966.

Golding, Arthur. *Shakespeare's Ovid, being Arthur Golding's translation of the Metamorphoses.* Facsimile reprint of the edition of 1567, edited by W. H. D. Rouse. London: De la More Press, 1904.

Grafton, Richard. *Grafton's Chronicle; or; History of England to which is Added his Table of Bailiffs, Sheriffs, and Mayors of the City of London. From the Year 1189, to 1558, inclusive.* [1569] 2 volumes. London: Private edition for J. Johnson and others, 1809.

Hall, Edmund. *The Union of the Two Noble Families of Lancaster and York* [1550] Facsimile reprint of Bodleian copy. Menston: Scolar Press, 1970.

Hawes, Stephen. *The Pastime of Pleasure.* Literal reprint of the earliest complete copy (1517), edited with introduction and notes on variants by William Edward Mead. Early English Text Society, Original Series 173. London: H. Milford; Oxford University Press, 1928.

Heywood, John. *The Spider and the Flie*. Reprinted from the edition of 1556, with introduction by A. W. Ward. Spenser Society edition, 1894. Reprint, New York: Burt Franklin, 1967.

--------. *Works, And Miscellaneous Short Poems*. Edited with introduction and notes by Burton A. Milligan. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1956.

*Historia Regis Henrici Septimi, a Bernardo Andrea Tholosate Conscripta, Necnon Alia Quaedam and Eundem Regem Spectantia (Memorials of King Henry the Seventh).* Edited by James Gairdner. London: H. M. Stationery Office, 1858.

Holinshed, Raphael. *Chronicles of England, Scotland, and Ireland.* 6 vols. London: Privately published for J. Johnson and others, 1807.

Leo Hebraeus. *The Philosophy of Love.* Translated from the Italian edition, c. 1501, with introduction by F. Friedberg-Seeley and Jean H. Barnes. London: Soncino Press, 1937.

*Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, of the Reign of Henry VIII.* Edited at the Public Record Office, Great Britain, by J. S. Brewer, J. Gairdner, and R. H. Brodie. 36 vols. London: H. M. Stationery Office, 1862-1932.

Lydgate, John. *The Assembly of Gods, or The Accord of Reason and Sensuality in the Fear of Death.* Edited with introduction, notes and index by Oscar Lovell Triggs. 4 vols. Early English Text Society, Extra Series, 69, 80, 84, 89. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner, 1896.

--------. *Life of Our Lady.* Critical edition from the manuscripts with introduction and notes by Joseph A. Lauritis and others. Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 1961.

--------. *Lydgate's Fall of Princes*. Edited with introduction, notes and illustrations by Henry Bergen. 4 vols. Washington: The Carnegie Institution, 1923.

--------. "Lydgate's Mumming at Hertford." Edited by E. P. Hammond, *Anglia,* XXII (1899), 364-374.

--------. *The Minor Poems of John Lydgate.* Edited by Henry Noble MacCracken, with Merriam Sherwood. Early English Text Society, Original Series 192. London: Humphrey Milford, 1934.

--------. *Poems.* Edited with introduction, notes and glossary by John Norton-Smith. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1966.

Machiavelli, Niccolò. *The Art of War.* Translation by Ellis Farnsworth, revised and edited with introduction by Neal Wood. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, Library of Liberal Arts, 1965.

--------. *Machiavelli's The Prince: An Elizabethan Translation.* Edited from the manuscript in the collection of Mr. Jules Furthman, with introduction and notes by Hardin Craig. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1944.

--------. *The Prince and the Discourses.* Translated by Luigi Ricci and Christian E. Detmold, with an introduction by Max Lerner. New York: Random House, 1950.

Mancini, Dominic. *The Usurpation of Richard the Third.* Translated with introduction, notes, and parallel texts by C. A. J. Armstrong. Oxford: Clarendon Press, [1936] 1969.

*The Mirror for Magistrates.* Edited with introduction by Lily B. Campbell, for Huntington Library. Cambridge: University Press, 1938; reprint, New York: Barnes and Noble, 1968.

More, Sir Thomas. *The Complete Works.* Edited with introductions and notes by Edward Surtz, J. H. Hexter and others. 5 vols., to date. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1963-.

--------. (attributed) *History of King Richard III, with The Conclusion of the History of King Richard III from Hardyng's Chronicle, London, 1543.* Edited with notes by J. Rawson Lumby. Cambridge: University Press, 1883.

Ovid. *The Metamorphosis.* Translated with introduction by Mary M. Innis. Harmondsworth: Penguin, [1955] 1967.

*Parts Added to The Mirror for Magistrates, by John Higgins and Thomas Blenerhasset.* Edited from original editions of 1574 and 1578 in the Huntington Library by Lily B. Campbell. Cambridge: University Press, 1946.

Pico della Mirandola, Giovanni. "On the Dignity of Man." Translated by Elizabeth Livermore Forbes. In *The Renaissance Philosophy of Man.* Edited by Ernest Cassirer, P. O. Kristeller, and J. H. Randall Jr. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1948, 223-254.

--------. *On the Dignity of Man; On Being and the One; The Heptaplus.* Translated by Charles Glenn Wallis, Paul J. W. Miller, and Douglas Carmichael. Edited with an introduction and notes by Paul J. W. Miller. Indianapolis and New York: Bobb-Merrill, Library of Liberal Arts, 1940.

*Philozophers Dyctes.* Wynken de Worde, 1528. *English Books, 1475-1640,* Microfilm Reel 46.

Puttenham, George. *The Arte of English Poesie.* Edited with introduction and index by Gladys Doidge Willcock and Alice Walker. Cambridge: University Press, [1936] 1970.

Rabelais, Francois. *The Histories of Gargantua and Pantagruel.* Translated with introduction by J. M. Cohen. Harmondsworth: Penguin, [1955] 1967.

Rastell, John. *The Pastime of People, or The Chronicles of Divers Realms; and most Especially of The Realm of England.* London, 1529. Rearranged edition, London: Privately published for F. C. Rivington and others, 1811.

*The Renaissance and the Reformation.* Translations of the writings of Martin Luther, John Calvin, Juan de Vives and others, edited by Donald Weinstein. New York and London: The Free Press; Collier-Macmillan, 1965.

*The Renaissance Philosophy of Man.* Translations of the writings of Petrarch, Pico della Mirandola and others, edited by E. Cassirer, P. O. Kristeller, and J. H. Randall Jr. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1948.

*Seneca His Tenne Tragedies Translated into English.* Edited by Thomas Newton, 1581. Introduction by T. S. Eliot. 2 vols. London: Constable, 1927; New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1927.

Sidney, Sir Philip. *The Countess of Pembroke's Arcadia.* With the additions of Sir William Alexander and Richard Beling, a life of the author, and an introduction by Ernest L. Baker. London: Routledge, 1907.

--------. *A Defense of Poetry.* Edited with introduction and notes by J. A. Van Dorsten. London: Oxford University Press, 1966.

Smith, Thomas. *A Discourse of the commonweal of this realm of England.* 1581 Edited by Mary DeWar of Folger Shakespeare Library. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 1969.

Spenser, Edmund. *Faerie Queene, A Poem in Six Books, with the Fragment, Mutabilite.* Edited from the quartos of 1590 and 1596 by

Thomas J. Wise, pictured by Walter Crane. 6 vols. London: G. Allen, 1895-1897.

--------. *A Selection of His Works.* Edited with introduction and notes by Ian C. Sowton. Toronto: Macmillan, 1968.

Surrey. Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey, Sir Thomas Wyatt the Elder, Nicholas Grimald and Uncertain Authors. *Tottel's Miscellany: Songes and Sonnettes.* First edition of 5th June, collated with second edition of 31st July, 1557. Edited by Edward Arber. Westminster: A. Constable, 1903.

Taverner, Richard. *Proverbs or Adages by Desiderius Erasmus Gathered out of the "Chiliades" and Englished.* [1569] Facsimile edition with introduction by Dewitt T. Starnes. Gainesville, Florida: Scholars' Facsimiles and Reprints, 1956.

Vergil, Polydore. *The Anglica Historia of Polydore Vergil A. D. 1485-1537.* Translated, with introduction and parallel texts, by Denys Hay. Camden Series LXXIV. London: Royal Historical Society, 1950.

Vives, Juan Luis. "A Fable about Man." Translated by Nancy Lenkeith. In *The Renaissance Philosophy of Man*, edited by E. Cassirer, P. O. Kriesteller, J. H. Randall Jr. and others. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1948, 387-393.

Whitney, Geffrey. *A Choice of Emblems and Other Devises.* The edition of 1586 edited with introduction by Henry Green. London: 1866; facsimile reprint, Hildesheim and New York: Georg Olms, 1971.

York Court of High Commission, 1575/6-1580, HC AB9, Folio 20.

## Secondary Sources

### 1. Literary Criticism

Anderson, Ruth L. *Elizabethan Psychology and Shakespeare's Plays.* University of Iowa Humanistic Studies. Iowa City: University of Iowa Press, 1927.

Allen, D. C. "Some Observations on the 'Rape of Lucrece,'" *Shakespeare Survey,* XV (1962), 89-98.

Babb, Lawrence. *The Elizabethan Malady: A Study of Melancholia in English Literature from 1580-1642.* East Lansing: Michigan State College Press, 1951.

Barton, Anne. "Shakespeare and the Limits of Language," *Shakespeare Survey*, XXIV (1971), 19-30.

Bernard, J. E. Jr. *The Prosody of the Tudor Interludes*. Yale Studies in English. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1939. Reprint, New York: Archon Reprint, 1966.

Bevington, David M. *From Mankind to Marlowe: Growth of Structure in the Popular Drama of Tudor England*. Cambridge [Mass.] : Harvard University Press, 1962.

--------. *Tudor Drama and Politics: A Critical Approach to Topical Meaning.* Cambridge [Mass.] : Harvard University Press, 1968.

Berry, Ralph. "The Words of Mercury," *Shakespeare Survey*, XXII (1969), 69-77.

Blatt, Thora Balslev. *The Plays of John Bale. A Study of Ideas, Techniques and Style.* Copenhagen: G. E. C. Gad, 1968.

Borinski, Ludwig. "'Soldat' und 'Politiker' Bei Shakespeare und Seinen Zeitgenossen" ("The Soldier and the Politician in the Works of Shakespeare and His Contemporaries"), *Shakespeare Jahrbuch*, XCI (1955), 89-120.

Boswell-Stone, W. G. *Shakespeare's Holinshed: The Chronicle and the Historical Plays Compared.* London: 1896, 1907. Reprint, New York: Dover, 1968.

Boughner, Daniel C. *The Braggart in Renaissance Comedy: A Study in Comparative Drama from Aristophanes to Shakespeare.* Minneapolis: Minnesota University Press, 1954.

Bradbrook, M. C. *Themes and Conventions of Elizabethan Tragedy.* Cambridge: University Press, 1935.

Bradley, A. C. *Shakespearean Tragedy: Lectures on Hamlet, Othello, King Lear, Macbeth.* London: Macmillan, [1904] 1966.

*The Cambridge History of English Literature.* Edited by A. W. Ward and A. R. Walker. 15 vols. II. The End of the Middle Ages; III. Renascence and Reformation. Cambridge: University Press, 1908-1927.

Campbell, Lily B. *Shakespeare's 'Histories:' Mirrors of Elizabethan Policy.* San Marino, Calif. : Huntington Library, 1947.

Chambers, E. K. *English Literature at the Close of the Middle Ages.* Oxford History of English Literature. Oxford: Clarendon Press, [1945] 1947.

Churchill, George B. *Richard the Third up to Shakespeare.* Palaestra X. Berlin: Mayer and Müller, 1900. Reprint, New York: Johnson Reprint, 1970.

Clemen, Wolfgang. *English Tragedy before Shakespeare: The Development of Dramatic Speech.* [1955] Translated from the German by T. S. Dorsch. London: Methuen, 1961.

--------. *A Commentary on Shakespeare's Richard III.* [1957] English version by Jean Bonheim. London: Methuen, 1968.

--------. *The Development of Shakespeare's Imagery*. Translated from the German, *Shakespeares Bilder* [1936], with a preface by J. Dover Wilson. London: Methuen, 1951.

Coleridge, Samuel Taylor. *Coleridge's Shakespearean Criticism.* Edited by Thomas Middleton Raysor. 2 vols. London: Constable, 1930.

--------. *Biographia Literaria.* Edited with his Aesthetical Essays by J. Shawcross. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1907.

Cunliffe, John W. *The Influence of Seneca on Elizabethan Tragedy.* London, 1893. Reprint, Hamden, Conn.: Archon Books, 1965.

Donohue, Joseph W. *Dramatic Character in the English Romantic Age.* Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1970.

Doran, Madeleine. *Endeavors of Art: A Study of Form in Elizabethan Drama.* Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1954.

Draper, John W. *The Humours and Shakespeare's Characters.* Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press, 1945.

Dunn, Catherine. "The Medieval 'Cycle' as History Play: An Approach to the Wakefield Plays," *Studies in the Renaissance*, VII (1960), 76-89.

Ewbank, Inga-Stina. "'More Pregnantly than Words:' Some Uses and Limitations of Visual Symbolism" *Shakespeare Survey*, XXIV (1971), 13-18.

Farnham, Willard. *The Medieval Heritage of Elizabethan Tragedy*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1936.

Fish, Stanley Eugene. *John Skelton's Poetry*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1965.

Frazer, N. L. *English History in Contemporary Poetry*. III. The Tudor Monarchy, 1485 to 1588. London: Bell and Sons, 1914.

Frye, Northrop. Anatomy of Criticism: Four Essays. [1957] Reprint, New York: Atheneum, 1966.

--------. "Old and New Comedy," Shakespeare Survey, XXII (1969), 1-5.

Gilbert, Allan H. "Fortune in the Tragedies of Giraldi Cintio," Renaissance Studies in Honor of Hardin Craig. Edited by Baldwin Maxwell and others. Stanford, Calif. : Stanford University Press [1914]. 32-43.

Gradon, Pamela. Form and Style in Early English Literature. London: Methuen, 1971.

Greg, W. W. The Play of Antichrist from the Chester Cycle. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1935.

Harris, Jesse W. John Bale, A Study in the Minor Literature of the Reformation. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1940.

Hudson, H. H. "Grimald's Translations from Beza," Modern Language Notes, XXXIX (1924), 388-394.

Kirsch, James. Shakespeare's Royal Self. New York: G. P. Putnam, for Jung Foundation of Analytical Psychology, 1966.

Knight, G. Wilson. The Sovereign Flower: On Shakespeare as a Poet of Royalism. With appendices of shorter essays, radio talks, and index to the other's previous works. London: Methuen, 1958.

Koelbing, Arthur. "Barclay and Skelton, Early German Influences in English Literature," Cambridge History of English Literature, III, 56-82.

Kolve, V. A. The Play Called Corpus Christi. Stanford, Calif. : Stanford University Press, 1966.

Kott, Jan. Shakespeare Our Contemporary. Translated from the Polish by Boleslaw Taborski. London: Methuen, 1964.

Law, Robert A. "The Composition of Shakespeare's Lancastrian Trilogy," Texas Studies in Language and Literature, III (1961), 321-327.

Lewis, C. S. The Allegory of Love: A Study in Medieval Tradition. London: Oxford University Press, [1936] 1969.

--------. English Literature in the Sixteenth Century Excluding Drama. The Completion of the Clark Lectures, Trinity College, Cambridge, 1944. Oxford History of English Literature. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1954.

Lucken, L. V. *Anti-Christ and the Prophets of Anti-Christ in the Chester Cycle*. Washington: Catholic University of America, 1940.

Mackenzie, W. Roy. *The English Moralities from the Point of View of Allegory.* Boston: Ginn, 1914.

MacKinnon, Effie, "Notes on the Dramatic Structure of the York Cycle," *Studies in Philogy*, XXVIII (1931), 433-449.

Margeson, J. M. R. *The Origins of English Tragedy*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967.

Matthews, Honor. *Character and Symbol in Shakespeare's Plays: A Study of Certain Christian and Pre-Christian Elements in Their Structure and Imagery*. Cambridge: University Press, 1962.

McCain, John Walker. "Oratory, Rhetoric and Logic in the Writings of John Heywood," *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, XXVI (1940), 44-47.

Murison, William. "Stephen Hawes," *Cambridge History of English Literature.* III, 223-238.

Murry, John Middleton. *Shakespeare*. London: Jonathan Cape, 1936.

Orrell, John. *The Repeated Scene: Formal Parallelism in Elizabethan Tragedy.* Diss. Toronto, 1963. Facsimile publication, Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms, Xerox Company, 1972.

Pacific Northwest Renaissance Conference, March 15-17, 1974, University of Saskatchewan, Regina, Sask. Papers given are in press.

Parker, Rosco E. "The Reputation of Herod in Early English Literature," *Speculum*, VIII (1933), 59-67.

Partridge, A. C. *The Language of Renaissance Poetry: Spenser, Shakespeare, Donne, Milton.* London: Andre Deutsch, 1971.

Reese, Gertrude. "Political Import of *The Misfortunes of Arthur*," *Review of English Studies*, XXXI (1945). 81-91.

Reese, M. M. *The Cease of Majesty: A Study of Shakespeare's History Plays*. London: Edward Arnold, 1961.

Ribner, Irving. *The English History Play in the Age of Shakespeare.* Princeton: University Press, 1957.

Righter, Anne. *Shakespeare and the Idea of the Play.* Harmondsworth: Penguin, with Chatto and Windus, 1962 1967.

Robbins, Edwin W. *Dramatic Characterization in Printed Commentaries on Terence 1473-1600.* Illinois Studies in Language and Literature XXXV-4. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1951.

L

Rossiter, A. P. Angel with Horns, and Other Shakespeare Lectures. Edited from his lectures by Graham Storey. New York: Theatre Arts Books, 1961.

Sanders, Wilbur. The Dramatist and the Received Idea: Studies in the Plays of Marlowe and Shakespeare. Cambridge: University Press, 1968.

Spivack, Bernard. Shakespeare and the Allegory of Evil: The History of a Metaphor in Relation to His Major Villains. New York: Columbia University Press, 1958.

Schelling, Felix E. The English Chronicle Play. New York: Macmillan, 1902.

Schücking, Levin L. Character Problems in Shakespeare's Plays. Translated from the German. Leipzig, 1919. London: Harrap, 1922.

Smith, Robert Metcalf. Froissart and the English Chronicle Play. New York: Columbia University Press, [1915] 1951. Reissued, New York: Benjamin Blom, 1965.

Spurgeon, C. F. E. Shakespeare's Imagery, and What It Tells Us. Cambridge: University Press, 1935.

--------. Shakespeare's Iterative Imagery (i) As Undersong, (ii) As Touchstone to His Work. Proceedings of the British Academy XVII, 1931, 147-148.

Stoll, Elmer Edgar. Art and Artifice in Shakespeare: A Study in Dramatic Contrast and Illusion. Cambridge: University Press, 1933. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1962.

Stroup, Thomas B. Microcosmos: The Shape of the Elizabethan Play. Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1965.

Swenson, Esther L. An Inquiry into the Composition and Structure of Ludus Coventriae, with A Note on the Home of Ludus Coventriae by Hardin Craig. Bulletin of the University of Minnesota. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, Press, 1914.

Talbert, Ernest William. The Problem of Order: Elizabethan Political Commonplaces and an Example of Shakespeare's Art. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1962.

Tillyard, E. M. W. The English Epic and Its Background. London: Chatto and Windus, 1954.

--------. Shakespeare's History Plays. London: Chatto and Windus, 1944.

Tomlinson, W. E. Der Herodes-Charakter im englischen Drama. Palaestra 195. Leipzig: Mayer and Muller, 1934.

Tuve, Rosemond. Elizabethan and Metaphysical Imagery: Renaissance Poetic and Twentieth-Century Critics. Chicago : University of Chicago Press, 1947.

Valency, Maurice J. The Tragedies of Herod and Mariamne. New York: Columbia University Press, 1940. Reprint, New York: AMS Press, 1966.

Vandiver, E. P. Jr. "The Elizabethan Dramatic Parasite," Studies in Philology, XXXII (1935), 411-427.

von Schlegel, A. W. A Course of Lectures on Dramatic Art and Literature [1808] Translated from the German by John Black. Edited by R. H. Horne. 2 vols. London: Templeton, Smith, 1815.

Watson, Sara Ruth. "Gorboduc and the Theory of Tyrannicide," Modern Language Review, XXXIV (1939), 355-366.

Withington, Robert. "Paronomasia in John Heywood's Plays," Smith College Studies in Modern Languages, XXI (1939-1940), 221-239.

Williamson, George. The Senecan Amble: A Study in Prose Form from Bacon to Collier. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1951.

Wilson, F. P. The English Drama 1485-1585. Edited with a bibliography by G. K. Hunter. Oxford History of English Literature. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969.

Winny, James. The Player King: A Theme of Shakespeare's Histories. London: Chatto and Windus, 1968.

Young, Karl. "The Influence of French Farce upon the Plays of John Heywood," Modern Philology, II, 1904, 97-124.

Zandvoort, R. W. "The Messenger in the Early English Drama," English Studies, III (1921), 100-107.

### 2. History of Drama

Anglo, Sydney. Spectacle, Pageantry, and Early Tudor Policy. Oxford-Warburg Studies. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969.

Armstrong, William A. The Elizabethan Private Theatres: Facts and Problems. Folcroft, Pennsylvania: Folcroft Press, [1958] 1969.

Baskerville, Charles Read. The Elizabethan Jig. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1929.

Bentley, Gerald Eades. Shakespeare, A Biographical Handbook. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1961.

Bethell, Samuel L. Shakespeare and the Popular Tradition. Introduction by T. S. Eliot. Westminster: King and Staples, 1944.

Blackburn, Ruth H. Biblical Drama under the Tudors. The Hague and Paris: Mouton, 1971.

Boas, Frederick S. Queen Elizabeth in Drama, and Related Studies. London: Allen and Unwin, 1950.

Boas, Frederick. University Drama in the Tudor Age. Oxford: University Press, 1914. Reprint, New York: Benjamin Blom, 1961.

Bolwell, Robert W. The Life and Works of John Heywood. [1921] Reprint, New York: AMS Press, 1966.

Bowra, Sir Maurice. "Songs of Dance and Carnival," Italian Renaissance Studies: A Tribute to the Late Cecilia M. Ady. Edited with introduction by E. F. Jacob. London: Faber and Faber, 1960. 328-353.

Bradbrook, M. C. The Rise of the Common Player: A Study of Actor and Society in Shakespeare's England. London: Chatto and Windus, [1962] 1964.

Brooke, C. F. Tucker. The Tudor Drama: A History of English National Drama to the Retirement of Shakespeare. Boston, 1911, Reprint, New York: Archon Books, 1964.

Brown, Carlton. "Sermons and Miracle Plays," Modern Language Notes, XLIX (1934), 394-396.

Campbell, Lily B. Scenes and Machines on the English Stage during the Renaissance: A Classical Revival. Cambridge: University Press, 1923.

Carnahan, David Hobart. The Prologue in the Old French and Provencal Mystery. [1905] New York: Hastell House, 1966.

Chambers, E. K. The Elizabethan Stage. 4 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1923.

--------. The English Folk-Play. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1933.

--------. The Medieval Stage. 2 vols. London: Oxford University Press, [1903] 1967.

--------. Notes on the History of the Revels Office under the Tudors. London, 1906. Reprint, Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms, 1963.

--------. Shakespeare: A Survey. London: 1925. Reprint, New York: Hill and Wang, 1958.

Coffman, George R. "A Plea for the Study of the Corpus Christi Plays as Drama," Studies in Philology, XXVI (1929), 411-424.

Cohen, Gustave. Histoire de La Mise en Scène dans le Théatre Religieux Français du Moyen Age. Paris: Librairie Honoré Champion, [1926] 1951.

Craig, Hardin. "The Corpus Christi Procession and the Corpus Christi Play," Journal of English and Germanic Philology, XIII (1913), 589-602.

--------. English Religious Drama in the Middle Ages. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955.

--------. "A Note on the Home of Ludus Coventriae," in An Inquiry into the Composition and Structure of Ludus Coventriae, by Esther L. Swenson. Bulletin of the University of Minnesota. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1914. 72-83.

Craik, T. W. The Tudor Interlude: Stage, Costume, and Acting. Leicester: University Press, 1958.

Dexter, T. F. G. The Pagan Origin of Fairs. Perranporth, Cornwall: New Knowledge Press, n. d.

Edwards, H. L. R. Skelton: The Life and Times of an Early Tudor Poet. London: Jonathan Cape, 1949.

The Elizabethan Theatre II. Papers given at the Second International Conference on Elizabethan Theatre, at University of Waterloo, Ontario, July, 1969. Edited with introduction by David C. Galloway. Toronto: Macmillan of Canada; University of Waterloo, 1970.

Fairholt, F. W. Lord Mayors' Pageants: Being Collections Toward a History of These Annual Celebrations. 2 vols.: I. History of Lord Mayors' Pageants; II. Reprints of Lord Mayors' Pageants. Percy Society Publication X. London: 1843-1844.

Foakes, R. A. "The Player's Passion: Some Notes on Elizabethan Psychology and Acting," Essays and Studies, VII (1954), 62-77.

Frank, Grace. The Medieval French Drama. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1954.

*Les Fêtes de la Renaissance.* Études réunies et présentées par Jean Jacquot. Paris: Centre Nationale de la Recherche Scientifique, 1956.

*Fêtes et cérémonies au Temps de Charles Quint.* Congrès de l'Association Internationale des Historiens de la Renaissance, 2., Bruxelles, 1957. Études de Marcel Bataillon [et al.], réunies et présentées par Jean Jacquot. Paris: Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1960.

Gardiner, Harold C. *Mysteries End: An Investigation of the Last Days of the Medieval Religious Stage*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1946.

Gildersleeve, Virginia C. *Government Regulation of the Elizabethan Drama*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1908.

Green, A. Wigfall. *The Inns of Court and English Drama*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press; Humphrey Milford and Oxford University Press, 1931.

Gordon, Ian A. *John Skelton, Poet Laureate.* Melbourne and London: Melbourne and Oxford University Presses, 1943. Reprint, Folcroft, Penna.: Folcroft Press, 1970.

Halliday, F. E. *A Shakespeare Companion, 1564-1964.* [1952] Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1964.

Harbage, Alfred. *Annals of English Drama, 975-1700: An Analytical Record of All Plays, Extant or Lost, Chronologically Arranged and Indexed.* Revised by S. Schoenbaum. Published in cooperation with the Modern Language Association of America. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1940.

--------. *Shakespeare and the Rival Traditions*. New York: Macmillan, 1952.

Hardison, O. B. *Christian Rite and Christian Drama in the Middle Ages: Essays in the Origin and Early History of Modern Drama.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1965.

Hargreaves-Mawderley, W. N. *History of Legal Dress in Europe until the End of the Eighteenth Century*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1963.

Hatfield, Rab. "The Compagnia de' Magi," *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes,* XXXIII (1970), 107-161.

Herford, Charles H. *Studies in the Literary Relations of England and Germany in the Sixteenth Century*. Cambridge: University Press, 1886.

Huganir, Katheryn. "Medieval Theaters," The Theatre Annual, XXIII (1967), 34-45.

Joseph, Bertram L. Elizabethan Acting. Oxford English Monographs. London: Oxford University Press, [1951] second edition, 1964.

Kernodle, George R. From Art to Theatre: Form and Convention in the Renaissance. With appendices. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1944.

--------. "The Open Stage: Elizabethan or Existentialist?" Shakespeare Survey, XII (1959), 1-7.

Knights, L. C. Drama and Society in the Age of Jonson. London: Chatto and Windus [1937] 1968.

Koelbing, Arthur. "Barclay and Skelton, Early German Influences in English Literature," Cambridge History of English Literature, III, 56-82.

Le Lieu Théâtral a la Renaissance. Royaumont 22-27 Mars 1963. Études de S. Anglo [et al.] , réunies et présentées par Jean Jacquot avec la collaboration d'Elie Konigson et Marcel Oddon. Paris: Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1964.

Linthicum, M. Channing. Costume in the Drama of Shakespeare and His Contemporaries. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1936.

Long, Richard. "John Heywood, Chaucer, and Lydgate," Modern Language Notes, LXIV (1949), 55-56.

Maxwell, Ian. French Farce and John Heywood. Melbourne and London: Melbourne and Oxford University Presses, 1946.

Marker, Lise-Lone. "Nature and Decorum in the Theory of Elizabethan Acting," The Elizabethan Theatre II, edited with introduction by David C. Galloway. Toronto: Macmillan of Canada; University of Waterloo, 1970, 87-107.

Meyer, Edward. Machiavelli and the Elizabethan Drama. Weimar: Litterarhistorische Forshungen, 1897. Reprint, New York: Burt Franklin, 1963.

Mill, Anna Jean. "The Stations of the York Corpus Christi Play," Yorkshire Archaeological Journal, XXXVII (1951), 492-502.

Nicoll, Allardyce. The Development of the Theatre: A Study of Theatrical Art from the Beginnings to the Present Day. [1937] New York: Harcourt, Brace, third edition, 1946.

--------. *Masks, Mimes and Miracles: Studies in the Popular Theatre.* New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1931.

Nichols, John. *The Progresses and Public Processions of Queen Elizabeth.* 3 vols. London: 1788-1805, 1823.

Purvis, J. S. *From Minster to Market Place.* York: St. Anthony's Press, 1969.

Reed, A. W. *Early Tudor Drama: Medwall, the Rastells, Heywood, and the More Circle.* London: Methuen, 1926.

*References to the Mystery Plays and Corpus Christi Festival in York Civic Records.* Translated from Latin, French and Middle English, and prepared by Joyce W. Fowkes, York City Archivist. A holding of York City Library, n. d.

*Register of the Guild of Corpus Christi in the City of York.* Edited by Robert H. Skaife. Surtees Society, vol. 57. Durham: Andrews, 1872.

Roaten, Darnell. *Structural Forms in the French Theater 1500-1700.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1960.

Rosenberg, Marvin. "Elizabethan Actors: Men or Marionettes," *Publications of the Modern Language Association.* LXIX (1954), 915-927.

Rossiter, A. P. *English Drama from Early Times to the Elizabethans.* London: Hutchinson's University Library, 1950.

Salter, F. M. *Medieval Drama in Chester.* Toronto: University Press, 1955.

Salter, F. M. and W. W. Greg. *The Trial and Flagellation with Other Studies in the Chester Cycle.* With an edition of a new-found manuscript. Malone Society facsimile reprint. London: Oxford University Press, 1935.

Shapiro, I. A. "The Bankside Theatres: Early Engravings," *Shakespeare Survey,* I (1948), 25-37.

Sharp, Thomas. *A Dissertation on the Pageants or Dramatic Mysteries Anciently Performed at Coventry by the Trading Companies of that City; Chiefly with Reference to the Vehicle, Characters, and Dresses of the Actors.* With the text of The Pageant of the Shearmen and Taylors' Company and other municipal entertainments. Coventry: Merridew and Son, 1825.

Southern, Richard. *The Medieval Theatre in the Round.* London: Faber and Faber, 1957.

--------. The Open Stage and the Modern Theatre in Research and Practice. London: Faber and Faber, 1953.

--------. The Staging of Plays before Shakespeare. London: Faber and Faber, 1973.

Strong, R. C. and J. A. Van Dorsten. Leicester's Triumph. Published for Sir Thomas Browne Institute. Leiden and London: Leiden and Oxford University Presses, 1964.

Styan, J. L. Shakespeare's Stagecraft. Cambridge: University Press, 1967.

Thomas, Sidney. "Wolsey and the French Farces," Times Literary Supplement, 7 Dec. 1935, 838.

Tunison, Joseph S. Dramatic Traditions of the Dark Ages. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1907. Reprint, New York: Burt Franklin, 1970.

Venezky, Alice S. Pageantry on the Shakespearean Stage. New York: Twayne Publishers, 1951.

Vriend, Joannes S. J. The Blessed Virgin Mary in Medieval Drama of England. Perramend: J. Munsses, 1928.

Welsford, Enid. The Court Masque: A Study in the Relationship Between Poetry and the Revels. New York: Russell and Russell, with Cambridge University, [1927] 1966.

Wickham, Glynne. Early English Stages 1300-1660. 2 vols. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1966-1971.

Williams, Arnold. The Characterization of Pilate in the Towneley Plays. East Lansing [Mich.] : Michigan State College Press, 1950.

Withington, Richard. English Pageantry, An Historical Outline. 2 vols. Cambridge [Mass.] : Harvard University Press, 1918-1920.

## 3. History of Art

Blunt, Anthony. Artistic Theory in Italy, 1450-1600. London: Oxford University Press, 1940 1968.

Blomfield, Sir Reginald. History of Renaissance Architecture in England 1500-1800. 2 vols. London: Bell, 1897.

Butler, H. B., C. R. L. Fletcher, and Emery Walker. *Historical Portraits.* 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1909-1919.

Buxton, John. *Elizabethan Taste.* London: Macmillan, 1963.

Cant, Reginald. *The Pictorial History of York Minster.* London: Pitkin, 1971.

Chastel, André. *The Crisis of the Renaissance 1520-1600.* Translated by Peter Price. Geneva: Editions d'Art Albert Skira, 1968.

Coulton, George G. *Art and the Reformation.* Cambridge: University Press, 1953.

Cuttler, Charles D. *Northern Painting from Pucelle to Bruegel.* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1968.

Daniells, Roy. "The Mannerist Element in English Literature," *University of Toronto Quarterly,* XXXVI (1966-1967), 1-11.

*Fountainebleau: L'Art en France, 1528-1610.* Edited by Sylvie Béguin, William McAllister Johnson and others, with an article by André Chastel, "Fountainebleau: Forms and Symbols." Catalogue, Exhibition 1 Mar. - 15 April, 1973. 2 vols. Ottawa: National Gallery, 1973.

Gombrich, E. H. "*Icones Symbolicae*: The Visual Image in Neo-Platonic Thought," *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, XI (1948), 163-192.

Gotch, J. A. *Early Renaissance Architecture of England.* London: B. T. Batsford, [1901] 1914.

Harvey, John. *The Gothic World 1100-1600: A Survey of Architecture and Art.* London: B. T. Batsford, 1950.

Hartt, Frederick. *The History of Renaissance Art.* New York: Harry N. Abrams, n. d. [1969-1970].

Hildburgh, W. L. *English Alabaster Carvings as Records of the Medieval Religious Drama.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1949.

Katzenellenbogen, Adolf. *Allegories of the Virtues and Vices in Medieval Art.* Translated by Alan J. P. Crick. London: Warburg Institute, 1939. Toronto and New York: George C. McLeod; W. W. Norton, 1964.

Langer, Susanne K. *Feeling and Form: A Theory of Art Developed from "Philosophy in a New Key."* New York: Scribner's, 1953.

Lauts, Jan. Carpaccio: Paintings and Drawings. Translated from the German by Eric Millman and Marguerite Kay. Greenwich, Conn.: Phaidon, 1962.

Lees-Milne, James. Tudor Renaissance. London: B. T. Batsford, 1951.

Lessing, Gotthold Ephraim. Laocoön: An Essay on the Limits of Painting and Poetry. [1766] Translated from the German with introduction, notes, and appendices, by Edward Allen McCormick, Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, Library of Liberal Arts, 1962.

Levey, Michael. Early Renaissance. Harmondsworth: Penguin, [1967] 1970.

--------. Painting at Court. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1971.

L'Orange, H. P. Studies on the Iconography of Cosmic Kingship in the Ancient World. Instituttet for Sammenlignende Kulturforskning. Oslo and London: H. Aschehong; Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner, 1953.

Mâle, Emile. Art and the Reformation. Oxford: Blackwell, 1928.

Michelangelo. The Complete Work of Michelangelo. Edited by Mario Salmi, with articles by Charles DeTolnay, Eugenio Garin, Roberto Salvini and others. New York: Reynal, William Morrow, n. d. [1964].

Panofsky, Erwin. Meaning in the Visual Arts. Garden City, New York: Doubleday Anchor, 1955.

--------. Studies in Iconology. Humanistic Themes in the Art of the Renaissance. New York: Harper and Row, [1933] 1962.

Piper, David. The English Face. London: Thames and Hudson, 1947.

Saxl, Fritz. A Heritage of Images: A selection of Lectures. Edited by Hugh Honour and John Fleming, with introduction by E. H. Gombrich. London: Warburg Institute, 1957. Reprint, Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1970.

Shearman, John. Mannerism. Style and Civilization Series. Harmondsworth: Penguin, [1967] 1969.

Strong, Roy. The Elizabethan Image: Painting in England 1540-1620. Catalogue, Tate Gallery Exhibition, 28-Nov. 1969-8 Feb. 1970. London: Tate Gallery, 1969.

--------. Holbein and Henry VIII. Studies in British Art. Paul Mellon Foundation for British Art. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1967.

--------. *Portraits of Queen Elizabeth I.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1963.

--------. *Tudor and Jacobean Portraits, National Portrait Gallery.* 2 vols. London: H. M. Stationery Office, 1969.

Sypher, Wylie. *Four Stages of Renaissance Style: Transformations in Art and Literature, 1500-1700.* Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1955.

Thurlow, Gilbert. *Norwich Cathedral.* Norwich: Jarrold, n. d.

--------. *Norwich Cathedral.* London: Pitkin, 1971.

Tudor-Craig, Pamela. *Richard III.* Catalogue, Exhibition 27 June - 7 Oct. 1973. London: National Portrait Gallery, 1973.

van de Passe the Elder, Crispin. *Queen Elizabeth I: Elisabet D. G. Angliae, Franciae, Hiberniae, et Verginiae Regina, Fidei Christianae Propugnatrix Acerrima, Nuncin Dno Requiescens.* Engraving, after a drawing by Isaac Oliver. London: Victoria and Albert Museum, Dept. of Prints and Drawings E. 3288, 1960.

Vallance, Aylmer. *Art in England During the Elizabethan and Stuart Periods.* London: The Studio, 1908.

Wind, Edgar. "Studies in Allegorical Portraiture," *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes,* I (1937-1938), 138-162.

Wittkower, Rudolf. *Architectural Principles in the Age of Humanism.* London: Alex Tiranti, 1967.

Wölfflin, Heinrich. *Principles of Art History: The Problem of the Development of Style in Later Art.* [1932] Translated by M. D. Hottinger. New York: Dover Publications, 1950.

Woodward, G. W. O. *King Henry VIII.* London: Pitkin Pictorials, 1970.

--------. *Queen Elizabeth I.* London: Pitkin Pictorials, 1971.

Yates, Francis A. "Queen Elizabeth as Astraea," *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes,* X (1947), 27-82.

--------. *The Art of Memory.* London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1966.

## 4. Social, Political, and Economic History

Bindoff, S. T. "Clement Armstrong and His Treatises on the Commonweal," *Economic History Review*, XIV (1944-1945), 64-73.

--------. *Tudor England*. Harmondsworth: Penguin, [1950] 1971.

Black, J. B. *The Reign of Elizabeth 1558-1603.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1936, second edition 1959 (1965).

Bowden, Peter J. *The Wool Trade in Tudor and Stuart England.* London: Frank Cass, [1962] 1971.

Brooke, Christopher. *Medieval Church and Society.* London: Sidgwick and Jackson, 1971.

Carus-Wilson, E. M. *Medieval Merchant Venturers.* London: Methuen, 1954.

Caspari, Fritz. *Humanism and the Social Order in Tudor England.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1954.

Chrimes, S. B. *Henry VII.* London: Eyre, Methuen, 1972.

Curtis, Lionel. *Civitas Dei: The Commonwealth of God.* London: Macmillan, 1938.

DeRoover, Raymond. *The Rise and Decline of the Medici Bank 1397-1494.* President and Fellows, Harvard College, 1963. Cambridge [Mass.]: W. W. Norton, and Harvard University Press, 1966.

Dickens, A. G. *Robert Holgate Archibishop of York and President of the King's Council in the North.* Borthwick Institute of Historical Research. London: St. Anthony's Press, 1955.

--------, and Dorothy Carr. *The Reformation in England.* London: Edward Arnold, 1967.

Doernberg, Erwin. *Henry VIII and Luther: An Account of Their Personal Relations.* With a foreward by Gordon E. Rupp. London: Barrie and Rockliff, 1961.

Elton, G. R. *"The Body of the Whole Realm:" Parliament and Representation in Medieval and Tudor England.* Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 1969.

--------. *England under the Tudors.* London: Methuen, 1955.

--------. *Policy and Police: The Enforcement of the Reformation in the Age of Thomas Cromwell.* Cambridge: University Press, 1972.

--------. The Tudor Revolution in Government; Administrative Changes in the Reign of Henry VIII. Cambridge: University Press, 1953.

Figgis, John Neville. The Divine Right of Kings. Cambridge: University Press, 1914.

Gairdner, James. Henry the Seventh. London and New York: Macmillan, 1889.

Halsted, Caroline. Life of Margaret Beaufort, Countess of Richmond and Derby. London: Smith, Elder, 1839.

Hatcher, John. Rural Economy and Society in the Duchy of Cornwall 1300-1500. Cambridge: University Press, 1970.

Heaton, Herbert. The Yorkshire Woolen and Worsted Industry from Earliest Times up to the Industrial Revolution. Oxford: Clarendon Press [1920] 1965.

Hind, Arthur M. Wenceslaus Hollar and His Views of London and Windsor in the Seventeenth Century. London: John Lane the Bodley Head, 1922.

Italian Renaissance Studies: A Tribute to the Late Cecelia M. Ady. Edited with Introduction by E. F. Jacob. London: Faber and Faber, 1960.

James, Mervyn E. A Tudor Magnate and the Tudor State: Henry Fifth Earl of Northumberland. Borthwick Institute of Historical Research. York: St. Anthony's Press, 1966.

Kerridge, Eric. Agrarian Problems in the Sixteenth Century. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1969.

Lunt, William E. Financial Relations of the Papacy with England. 2 vols.: Vol. II, 1327-1534, Studies in Anglo-Papal Relations during the Middle Ages. Cambridge, Mass.: Mediaeval Academy of America, 1962.

Maitland, F. W. The Constitutional History of England. Cambridge: University Press, 1913.

--------. "The Crown as a Corporation," in Selected Essays. Cambridge, 1936, 104-127. Reprinted, Law Quarterly Review, XVII (1901), 131-146.

Maurois, André. A History of France. Translated by Henry L. Binsse. London: Methuen, [1949] 1964.

McConica, James Kelsey. English Humanists and Reformation Politics under Henry VIII and Edward VI. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965.

Mohl, Ruth. *The Three Estates in Medieval and Renaissance Literature.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1933.

Neale, Sir John E. *Elizabeth I and Her Parliaments 1584-1601.* London: Jonathan Cape, 1957.

--------. J. E. *Queen Elizabeth I.* London: Jonathan Cape, 1934. Reprint, Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1960.

Newton, Arthur Percival. "The King's Chamber under the Early Tudors," *Economic History Review,* XXXII (1917), 348-372.

Palliser, D. M. *The Reformation in York 1534-1553.* Borthwick Institute of Historical Research, University of York. York: St. Anthony's Press, 1971.

Phillips, James Emerson. *Images of a Queen: Mary Stuart in Sixteenth Century Literature.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1964.

Pollard, A. F. *Henry VIII.* London: Longmans, Green, [1902] 1951.

--------. "Social Revolution and Catholic Reaction in Germany," *Cambridge Modern History, II.* The Reformation, 174-197. Edited by A. W. Ward and others. London and New York: Macmillan, 1918.

Power, Eileen E. *The Wool Trade in English Medieval History.* London: Oxford University Press, 1941.

Prestwick, Menna. *Cranfield: Politics and Profits under the Early Stuarts: The Career of Lionel Cranfield, Earl of Middlesex.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1966.

*The Reign of Henry VII from Contemporary Sources.* Compiled with introduction and notes by A. F. Pollard. 3 vols. London: Longmans, Green, 1913.

Robertson, H. M. "Sir Bevis Bulmer, a Large-Scale Speculator of Elizabethan and Jacobean Times," *Journal of Economics and Business History,* IV (1931-1932), 99-120.

Rupp, E. G. "Luther and the German Reformation to 1529," *The New Cambridge Modern History, II.* The Reformation, 70-95. Edited by G. R. Elton. Cambridge: University Press, 1958.

Russell, Conrad. *The Crisis of Parliaments: English History 1509-1660.* The Short Oxford History of the Modern World. London: Oxford University Press, 1971.

Scarisbrick, J. J. *Henry VIII.* London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1968. Reprint, Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1971.

Schevill, Ferdinand. The Medici. [1949] Reprint, New York: Harper, 1960.

Sisson, Charles J. and others. Thomas Lodge and Other Elizabethans. Cambridge [Mass.] : Harvard University Press, 1933.

Storey, R. L. The Reign of Henry VII. London: Blandford Press, 1968.

Stow, John. The Survey of London [1598] Introduction by H. B. Wheatley. London: Dent, 1912, revised 1956 1965.

Trevor-Roper, H. R. The Gentry 1540-1640. Economic History Society publication. London: Cambridge University Press, n. d.

The Tudor Constitution: Documents and Commentary. Edited and introduced by G. R. Elton. Cambridge: University Press, 1968.

Tudor Studies Presented to Albert Frederick Pollard. Edited with Introduction by R. W. Seton-Watson. London: University of London, 1924. Reprint, Freeport, New York: Books for Libraries Press, 1969.

Van der Wee, Herman. The Growth of the Antwerp Market and the European Economy. 3 vols. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1963.

Wernham, R. B. Before the Armada: The Growth of English Foreign Policy 1485-1588. London: Jonathan Cape, 1966.

Williams, George Huntston. The Radical Reformation. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1962.

Wilson, F. P. The Plague in Shakespeare's London. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1927.

Wolffe, B. P. The Royal Demesne in English History: The Crown Estate in the Governance of the Realm from the Conquest to 1509. Athens, Ohio: Ohio University Press, 1971.

Wright, Louis B. Middle-Class Culture in Elizabethan England. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1935.

The York Mercers and Merchant Adventurers 1356-1917. The records edited with introduction by Dr. Maude Sellers. Surtees Society Publication 129. London and Durham: Andrews, Bernard Quaritch, 1918.

## 5. Cultural History

Aristotle. *The Ethics of Aristotle.* The Nicomachean Ethics translated by J. A. K. Thomson. Harmondsworth and Baltimore: Penguin, 1953.

--------. *On Poetry and Music.* Translated by S. H. Butcher. Edited with introduction by Milton C. Nahm. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, Library of Liberal Arts, [1948] 1956.

--------. *On Poetry and Style.* Translated with introduction by G. M. A. Grube. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, Library of Liberal Arts, 1958.

--------. *The Politics.* Translated, with introduction by T. A. Sinclair. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1962.

Allen, Don Cameron. *Mysteriously Meant: The Rediscovery of Pagan Symbolism and Allegorical Interpretation in the Renaissance.* Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins Press, 1970.

Auerbach, Erich. *Literary Language and Its Public in the Late Latin Antiquity and in the Middle Ages* [1958] Translated from the German by Ralph Mannheim. New York: Pantheon Books, for the Bollingen Foundation, 1965.

--------. Mimesis: *The Representation of Reality in Western Literature* [1946] Translated from the German by Willard R. Trask. Princeton: University Press, [1953] 1958.

Anglo, Sydney. "The British History in Early Tudor Propaganda," *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library,* XLIV, No. 1 (Sept. 1961), 17-18.

Bevan, J. "Deification," *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*, IV, 525-533.

Bober, Harry. "The Zodiacal Miniatures of the Très Riches Heures of the Duke of Berry -- Its Sources and Meaning," *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, XI (1948), 1-34.

Bolgar, R. R. *The Classical Heritage and Its Beneficiaries*. Cambridge: University Press, 1954.

Burke, Peter. *The Renaissance Sense of the Past.* London: Edward Arnold, 1969.

Bush, Douglas. *Pagan Myth and Christian Tradition in English Poetry.* Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1968.

Campbell, Lily B. Tudor Conceptions of History and Tragedy in "A Mirror for Magistrates." Berkeley: University of California Press, 1936.

Cantimori, Delio. "Rhetoric and Politics in Italian Humanism," translated by Francis A. Yates, Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes, I (1937-1938), 83-102.

Caplan, Harry. "Rhetorical Invention in Some Medieval Tractates on Preaching," Speculum, II (1927), 284-295.

Cassirer, Ernst. The Individual and the Cosmos in Renaissance Philosophy. [1927] Translated with introduction by Mario Domandi. New York and Evanston: Harper and Row, 1964.

--------. The Myth of the State. New Haven and London: Yale and Oxford University Presses, 1946.

--------. The Platonic Renaissance in England. Translated by James P. Pettegrove. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1953.

Charlton, Kenneth. Education in Renaissance England. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1965.

Cooke, John Daniel. "Euhemerism: A Medieval Interpretation of Classical Paganism," Speculum II (1927), 396-410.

Curtis, Mark H. Oxford and Cambridge in Transition 1558-1642. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1959.

Duke Humphrey and English Humanism in the Fifteenth Century. Catalogue of exhibition held in the Bodleian Library, Oxford. Foreword by Robert Shackleton, librarian. Oxford: Bodleian Library, 1970.

The Encyclopaedia Britannica, A Dictionary of Arts, Sciences, Literature and General Information. 29 vols. Eleventh edition. Cambridge: University Press, 1910.

Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics. Edited by James Hastings and others. 13 vols. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1908-1915, 1967.

Evans, Maurice. "Metaphor and Symbol in the Sixteenth Century," Essays in Criticism, III (1953), 267-284.

Fergusson, Arthur B. The Indian Summer of English Chivalry. Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press, 1960.

Frazer, Sir James G. The Magical Origin of Kings. [1905] London: Dawsons of Pall Mall, [1920] 1968.

Geffcken, Johannes. "Euhemerism" Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics, V, 572-573.

Hocart, A. M. Kingship. London: Humphrey Milford, 1927

Hay, Denys. "History and Historians in France and England during the Fifteenth Century," Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research, XXXV (1962), 111-127.

Hudson, Hoyt Hopewell. The Epigram in the English Renaissance. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1947.

Innis, Harold A. The Bias of Communications. Introduction by Marshall McLuhan. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, [1951] 1964.

Kantorowicz, Ernst H. The King's Two Bodies: A Study in Medieval Political Theology. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1957.

Klauser, Theodor. A Short History of the Western Liturgy: An Account and Some Reflections. Translated from the German by John Halliburton. London: Oxford University Press, 1969.

Klibansky, Raymond, Erwin Panofsky and Fritz Saxl. Saturn and Melancholy: Studies in the History of Natural Philosophy, Religion and Art. With index of manuscripts. London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1964.

Kristeller, Paul Oskar. The Philosophy of Marsilio Ficino. Translated by Virginia Conant, with appendices on the congruence of Ficino's and Pico's doctrines. Gloucester, Mass.: Peter Smith, 1964.

Lewis, C. S. The Discarded Image. Cambridge: University Press, 1964 1967.

Literary Criticism, Plato to Dryden. Translated by various hands, and edited, with commentary, by Allan H. Gilbert. New York: American Book, 1940.

Lovejoy, Arthur O. The Great Chain of Being: A Study of the History of an Idea. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1950.

Lindsay, T. M. "Englishmen and the Classical Renaissance," in Cambridge History of English Literature, III, 1-24.

Nowotny, Karl Anton. "The Construction of Seals and Characters in the Work of Agrippa of Nettesheim," Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes, XII (1949), 46-57.

Owst, G. R. Literature and Pulpit in Medieval England. Cambridge: University Press, 1933.

Oxford Annotated Bible with the Apocrypha. Revised standard version edited with notes and appendices by Herbert G. May and Bruce M. Metzger. New York: Oxford University Press, 1965.

Plato. The Dialogues of Plato. Translated with introduction and analyses by B. Jowett. 5 vols. London: Humphrey Milford; Oxford University Press, 1871. Third edition, 1927.

The Play of Antichrist. Translated with introduction by John Wright. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 1967.

Raab, Felix. The English Face of Machiavelli; A Changing Interpretation, 1500-1700. Foreword by Hugh Trevor-Roper. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1964.

Rashdell, Hastings. The Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages. [1895] New edition edited by F. M. Powicke and A. B. Emden. 3 vols. London: Oxford University Press, 1936.

Schücking, L. L. The Sociology of Literary Taste. [1923] Translated from the German by E. W. Dickes.. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner, 1944. Reprint, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1966.

Schrickx. W. Shakespeare's Early Contemporaries: The Background of the Harvey-Nashe Polemic. Antwerpe: Nederlandsche Boekhandle, 1956.

Seebohm, Frederic. The Oxford Reformers: John Colet, Erasmus, and Thomas More, Being a History of Their Fellow-work. [1869] Third edition, London: Longmans, 1896.

Seznec, Jean. The Survival of the Pagan Gods. [1940] Translated from the French by Barbara F. Sessions. New York: Harper, 1961.

Short-title Catalogue of Books Printed in England, Scotland and Ireland, and of English Books Printed Abroad. Compiled by A. W. Pollard and G. R. Redgrave. London: Bibliographical Society, [1926] 1963.

Struever, Nancy. The Language of History in the Renaissance: Rhetorical and Historical Consciousness in Florentine Humanism. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1970.

Tillyard, E. M. W. The Elizabethan World Picture. London: Chatto and Windus, 1943.

--------. The English Renaissance, Fact or Fiction. London: Hogarth Press, 1960.

Van Kijk, S. J. P. and J. Hazelden Walker. The Origins of Modern Liturgy: Liturgy of the Papal Court and the Franciscan Order in the Thirteenth Century. London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1960.

Walker, T. A. "English and Scottish Education; Universities and Public Schools at the Time of Colet," in Cambridge History of English Literature, II, 341-371.

Wind, Edgar. Pagan Mysteries in the Renaissance. [1958] Harmondsworth: Penguin; Faber and Faber, 1967.

Yates, Francis A. Giordano Bruno and the Hermetic Tradition. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1964.